

THE CHARACTERISTIC DEMAND OF CHRISTIANITY IS FOR A NEW WORLD."—G. K. Chesterton

The New World

A Monthly Journal of Christian Thought and Practice

Vol. I. No. 1.

JANUARY, 1918

10 Cents

Signs of the Times

An Editorial Survey

Look's #s 2, 4.

Universal Military Training and World Peace

John Haynes Holmes

The Seeds of War in the Social Order

Willard L. Sperry

The Negro and the War

Oswald Garrison Villard

The Fellowship Press

118 East 28th Street, New York City

What the Soldiers Are Thinking About

In a recent issue of *The New Republic* (December 15, 1917), there was published a remarkable letter from an Englishman describing the present state of mind of the soldiers at the front. "He (the soldier) has recognized war as his duty," writes this English observer, "but he has never ceased to regard it with horror and, having made his choice with conviction, what he seeks is not an escape from the horns of a moral dilemma but a reconciliation of two moral certainties. He is less interested in Mr. Lloyd George's ministry of reconstruction than in St. Paul's ministry of reconciliation.

Reconciliation, as the soldiers at the front know well enough, is the password to the new world that is coming after the war. The time is at hand when stay-at-home civilians in church, politics, and business must learn to say that word.

Reconciliation—Fellowship—Service—that is the message of *The New World*, a monthly journal of Christian thought and practice.

The New World comes into being to proclaim anew the faith that the common life of mankind can and should be ordered in accordance with the spirit and principles of Jesus. *The New World* calls for a new order of life, a new quality of faith, a new spirit of courage and adventure in the service of the Kingdom of God.

The New World will appear on the first of each month and will contain a survey and interpretation of world events, news of significant movements of thought at home and abroad, a record of change and progress in the world of labor, and numerous special articles of wide general interest. Among contributors to early numbers will be: Prof. Harry F. Ward, Dr. Sydney Strong, Prof. C. Harold Dodd (Mansfield College, Oxford, England), Norman Thomas, Richard Roberts, Martha P. Falconer, W. E. Orchard (of London) Emily G. Balch, Roger N. Baldwin, Henry T. Hodgkin (of London) and Prof. Rufus Jones.

To the Editors of *The New World*:
The Fellowship Press,
118 East 28th Street,
New York City.

I am much interested in your plan. I enclose herewith \$1.00, please enter my name as a subscriber for one year.

Signed _____

Address _____

The New World

Vol. I. No. 1.

JANUARY, 1918

10 Cents

AN INTERPRETATION AND FORECAST

WHEN the war is over, the world will have to begin its life over again, and the sooner we get used to the idea the better. One of these days the thunder of the great guns will die away and quiet will return to the torn and troubled lands of the world,—and then? What kind of world is it going to be? How and after what pattern are we going to rebuild our ruined house? Shall we drift back to the old round of national self-interest, crooked diplomacy, *real politik* with its gospel of blood and iron, of the exploitation of the weak by the strong, and let it run its devious and dubious course to another inferno perhaps deeper and more fiery than this in which we are caught today? Or is there some other way. If so, what is it.

Let it be said at once—and it cannot be said too plainly or too frequently—that the end of the war is not the end of our task. The declaration of peace will be but the beginning of our task. The results of war are negative; it may arrest, it may prevent, it certainly destroys; but it contains no positive or constructive possibilities in itself. It liberates no moral impulses which continue when the sword is back in its sheath. Under the very best conditions it only creates a situation in which positive and constructive action may be possible afterwards. If any man suppose that the defeat of the Central Powers will of itself provide the circumstances and the energy necessary to remake this scheme of things “nearer to our hearts’ desire,” he is living in a fool’s paradise. He has the unbroken witness of history against him; and his hope and expectation are born not of knowledge but of the unthinking bias in human nature which goes on singing blindly and blandly, in the teeth of all the logic of history and of experience, that “there’s a good time coming.” There is no room for this simple-minded and facile optimism in the world today.

Our first business is to face the facts. The war will not leave us a clean slate on which we can make a new beginning. There are no breaks of this kind in history. The immediate political aims of the allied nations will probably be achieved; but no one in his senses can pretend to believe that the restorations and readjustments with which the Peace Conference will concern itself will be a final settlement of the age-long controversies of Europe. Will they at one stroke extinguish for good and all those self-regarding nationalisms which have drenched Europe in blood for centuries? When one considers the “just” claims of some of the belligerents on either side, can any settlement be conceived which will not leave a quantity of bad blood behind it? To suppose that the enemy nations are going to tumble over one another in their hurry to join the League of Nations is the mark of an innocent and simple mind, ignorant at once of human nature and of the indescribable tangle of European politics.

Thomas Paine wrote shortly after the signing of the Treaty guaranteeing the independence of the United States—“The times that tried men’s souls are over.” But no man can read John Fiske’s account of the years that followed without consenting to his judgment that they were more critical and trying than the period of the war itself. The scale of the present war and the vastness of its issues make it as certain as anything can well be that before many months are past we shall be entering upon the most trying and critical period of the world’s history.

THE MORAL PROFIT AND LOSS OF WAR

The exigencies of war have revealed very rich resources of moral power in all the belligerent peoples, and in an age which had appeared selfish and decadent, this is something to be devoutly thankful for. After this, it will require considerable hardi-

(RECAP)

HX1

W89

(incomp)

775019

hood to be cynical about human nature. The readiness to make sacrifices, the subordination of self-interest to a great social necessity, the willing return to simpler living, though by no means universal, have been sufficiently widespread to enable us to renew our faith in the essential soundness of humanity. And such good things as these, evoked by a contingency, it should be our business to establish upon permanent moral foundations so that they may remain abiding elements in the normal life of the commonwealth.

But from this moral gain there is a very considerable deduction to be made, so considerable indeed as certainly to leave an adverse balance. These are the peculiar moral reactions of the process of war. War is commonly thought of as a trial of strength. If it were a clean trial of strength there would conceivably be no pacifists, even though trials of strength however clean can never settle a question of right or wrong. But war is not a clean trial of strength. It is a method of destruction, primarily of the destruction of men. In modern war it is for the most part an impersonal mechanical destruction of men at long range; and both in combatants and non-combatants alike the indiscriminate destruction of men on a large scale must inevitably lead to a grave depression in the sense of the value of the single life. Our progress in the humanities has always depended upon an increasing evaluation of the individual; this has been the main spring of the struggle for liberty and is the ground of democracy. It is this depreciation of human value which war by its very nature produces that accounts for the fact that all great wars are followed by a period of political reaction.

Nor is this all. War cannot be successfully waged without evasion and obscuration of truth. Both on the field and among non-combatants, military advantage requires and systematically provides that the truth shall on occasion be distorted, concealed, or only half told. We do not forget that war evokes great heroisms and affords the opportunity of splendid sacrifice; but this cannot effectively countervail the moral damage to society of the legitimized contempt of truth which is of the essence of war. We must therefore be prepared to find at the close of the war an extensive and grave declension of moral tone among the belligerent people.*

* In this connection it is necessary that we should bear in mind a menace of another kind which is assuming the most ominous aspect. Mr. Sherwood Eddy quotes the *London Daily Mail*, of April 25th, 1917, as the authority for a statement in Parliament that there had been two hundred thousand cases of venereal disease in the British Army in France alone, not including those at home and on other fronts. Professor Finger at a meeting of the Medical Society in

THE COMING SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Further, it is becoming daily more evident that the unsettlement caused by the war is stimulating and releasing those deep currents of industrial and economic unrest which have for many years been gathering force and which have already accomplished a revolution in Russia. It is not generally perceived that the Russian Revolution is a new thing in the world. It is only secondarily political; in first intention, it is economic. This year is the fourth centenary of the Reformation, the birth time of *religious* liberty; it is only a century since men (after the tragic interlude of the Napoleonic wars) began to enter upon that inheritance of *political* liberty which the French Revolution affirmed. It may well prove that the Russian Revolution is the first act in the drama of *economic* emancipation.

In England, the Government Commission on the Causes of Labor Unrest reported recently that "the unrest is real, widespread, and in some directions extreme, and such as to constitute a national danger unless dealt with promptly and effectively. We are at this moment within view of a possible social upheaval or at least extensive and manifold strikes." Elsewhere the situation is similar; even through the thick gloom in which the inner life of Germany is shrouded there come premonitions of grave unrest in that country.

We may be entering upon a period of class-economic war; and we cannot afford to forget that this war has taught the proletariat how to make and how to use the munitions of war.

WANTED—A CHANGE OF HEART

These are some elements—though by no means all—of the terrific setting in which we shall have to set about the rebuilding of our ruined house. It is plainly neither simple nor easy. There is no single policy or plan which is sufficient to meet the complex demands of the situation. A number of things will have to be done at the same time. Not only shall we have to create anew some machinery of international relationships, but we shall have to recreate our domestic social order. War will not be eliminated from the world while the spirit of war remains in our economic and industrial systems.

Vienna early in the war, estimated that over 700,000, or ten per cent of the Austrian troops, were similarly affected. As one commanding Medical officer said: "There is enough venereal disease in these military camps now to curse Europe for three generations to come." (Sherwood Eddy "With Our Soldiers in France," page 114.) As it is, one in five of the urban population in Great Britain has been infected. It has been plausibly maintained that the Greek Empire declined as the result of the introduction of malaria from the East by Alexander's soldiers; and there are those who seriously predict the collapse of Western Civilization before the appalling invasion of this terrible scourge of syphilis.

Our business—to state it in very general terms—is to establish the principle and practice of cooperation both within and between communities in place of the competitive spirit which has hitherto chiefly determined the course of the world.

In this undertaking there is need of the statesman and the economist, the teacher, the political philosopher and the sociologist; but not all their learning and industry can produce anything more effectual than paper schemes unless there is behind it an entirely new temper and outlook among the mass of ordinary folk. As Bertrand Russell and others have pointed out, the only ultimate remedy for the troubles of mankind is “a change of heart.” The one indispensable condition of a stable world-order is a moral revolution. Are we storing up any spiritual and moral resources adequate to our task?

The assumption with which the “*New World*” starts out is that the clue to our problem is to be found in the Christian Gospel. This assumption as it stands is of course no more than a pulpit commonplace. The same thing has been said again and again by preacher and teacher; and the sentiment is always applauded to the echo in religious gatherings of all kinds. But nothing seems to come of it. We go on in the old way paying lip-service to the Ideal without any very serious intention of taking effectual steps to convert it into the Real. And nothing is likely to happen in the future without a changed attitude on the part of those who profess and call themselves Christians to the fundamental things of their faith. In other words, we must believe them to be true and that they represent the real and permanent values of life.

THE GROUND OF OUR HOPE

It is not within the purpose of our present statement to enter upon a criticism of the existing conditions within the church. But we confess that it fills us with dismay to observe how exceptional is that Christian voice today which is not a pulpit echo of the daily press. We pass by the extravagance of heated and undisciplined minds; they are always with us—in peace as in war; and we know what to expect from them. Our misgiving arises from the almost complete absence of any clear perception, on the part of those whose office it is to speak for the church, of its peculiar business in the world. Certain pious, somewhat apologetic caveats are entered against the excesses of temper incidental to war-time, and a vague and general obeisance is made to an ideal which is dismissed in the same breath as being too hopelessly impracticable for this hard

world. But concerning that radical and universal ministry of redemption to which the church is committed, we hear only an occasional voice in the wilderness. Such a truncated Gospel as we profess and preach today has in it no elements of hope for the world.

And when we come to consider the task of rebuilding a ruined civilization, what hope is there anywhere if not in the Christian Gospel? It still remains the one untried remedy for our social and international diseases. It is indeed true that here and there a soul or a company of souls has put it to the proof and has not found it wanting; but it still awaits a large-scale test. We speak of Christian nations and a Christian civilization, but this world has not yet seen either a nation or a civilization whose Christianity was more than skin deep. Our social life and our civilization are after all only barbarism touched lightly at this point and that by a Christian grace. And the redemption of the future is bound up with the root-and-branch Christianizing of the nations both in their domestic life and in their intercourse with one another. We do not delude ourselves by thinking that this is not a gigantic task; but whatever its dimensions may be, the plain fact remains that we have to set about it swiftly, if the rich gains of the upward struggle of the ages are not to be lost beyond recovery, and the world is to be saved from relapsing to savagery and dissolution.

OUR OUTLOOK AND PURPOSE

The task of “*The New World*” is to urge upon Christian people the immediate and pressing demand for a new quality of faith, a new type of understanding, a new order of life. We are facing a crisis upon which hangs issues of inconceivable moment for the future; Christianity is being challenged as never before in its history. But for Christianity, challenge should always spell opportunity; and the supreme miracle of Christianity is its endless capacity for renewal. “With Christianity, it is always sunrise somewhere in the world.” And this little paper appears in order simply and unaffectedly to reason with the Christians of America that they seek by prayer, by open-eyed thought and by a new measure of self-dedication to hasten the new healing sunrise of Christianity upon a shattered and war-weary world.

For the ills that beset our race the spirit of Christ is the one sole medicament, and what we need is that this spirit shall be enthroned in all human rela-

tionships, a single spirit governing not only the life of the individual in the simpler personal relationships but the whole common life of communities as it expresses itself in art, education and literature, in social and industrial aims and conditions, in politics both national and international.

That this involves a revolution is evident, but we are faced with this dilemma, that we must have *this* revolution or accept a revolution of another kind. For the spirit of revolution is in the world, and it is hastening to our very doors. But is this impending change to be a dance of death or a pageant of life? It is for us to say. Some day the strife of the nations will be at an end, and then—perhaps before then—we shall be engulfed in the maelstrom of wide social and economic upheaval. Will the church be able like its Lord to stand above the storm and say to the winds of human passion "Peace be still"? It is the chief tragedy of Christian history that the church has been too frequently caught unawares in the great emergencies. It was so in July, 1914;

is it to be so when peace comes back, and comes perhaps as it went away, like a thief in the night?

It is to the range of problems which these circumstances raise for Christianity that the "*New World*" proposes to address itself. It will do so without fear and without compromise, in the conviction that in this crisis as in every other, "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" can save us. It will endeavor to survey deliberately and carefully the difficult field of Christian conduct in the world as it is; it will face frankly and openly the disorders of our corporate life in their social and political aspects and seek with patience the Christian remedy; it will consider the endless complexities of international affairs and attempt to work out the Christian solution.

We recognize we are setting ourselves to an enormous task—a hopeless task, some would say. But we set about it not trusting in our own sufficiency, but in the faith that we are led to our adventure by the will of God and that He will use us for His purpose just as He has need of us.

Signs of the Times—An Editorial Survey

The President's Address to Congress

More and more by virtue of his unique position, his eloquence and idealism, President Wilson is looked upon as the spokesman not only for America but for all the Allies. His address at the opening of Congress has had the extraordinary result of being welcomed both by "moderates" and "bitter enders" here and abroad. The language the President used has given rise to many searching questions. On the whole there is a general agreement that the President believes that the peace he desires can only be attained by a decisive military victory over Germany or by revolution within the Empire.

The President's greatest service is his reiteration "that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because irresponsible rulers of a single country have done deep and abominable wrong." His frank admission that if the really idealistic ends of the Allies had been made plain at the very outset "the sympathy and enthusiasm of the Russian people might have been once for all enlisted on the side of the Allies" is very significant. Surely then, discussion and frank statement of terms here, in Great Britain, and in France cannot be amiss. If sections of public opinion are wrong and muddle-headed, "the only possible antidote," in the noble words of the President, "is the truth. It cannot be uttered too plainly or too often."

In spite of this our Tory press and leaders, even some Government officials, still are staunch advocates of a Prussian policy of repression. The measure of their success is the measure of the defeat of that democracy for which our sons and brothers go forth to die.

Missions Versus Munitions in the Turkish Empire

We cordially support the President in his advice against any immediate declaration of war against Turkey. Nevertheless there is a certain grim irony in the situation. Part of the moral driving power behind our participation in the war is our abhorrence of Turkish atrocities in Armenia and Syria. There is nothing worse in the world's history, and many an American when he thinks of them girds himself with new vigor for a war which he believes will make the repetition of these horrors forever impossible. Yet we are not at war with the nation which is primarily responsible for these crimes. We do not pretend to know all of the reasons for the President's policy, but we are persuaded that one important factor in his decision is his desire for the continuation of the magnificent work done by the American Armenian Relief Committee and by American schools in the Turkish Empire. Here at least are extraordinary illustrations of Christian idealism, and of a trust not so much in arms but in compassion and education, for the healing of some of the world's worst wrongs. In the time of reconstruction which is to come, it may well prove that the chief vindication of Christian principles and method will be found in the heroic work done in these dark days by missionaries and other representatives of Christianity within the Turkish Empire.

A New Kind of War Secretary

A constructive examination into the work of the War Department ought to be profitable. It is, of course, too early to comment on any of the testimony thus far published, but it is not too early to point out at least three definite services Secretary Baker has rendered the country.

1. He has insisted upon decent standards in the making of Army clothing. To one who knows the temper of the working class this act of justice seems as prudent as it is right and fair.

2. For the first time in history the Government has officially taken vigorous steps, not only to prevent vice and the diseases due to immorality, but actively to encourage clean living. The Fosdick Commission cannot, of course, overcome these evil lusts deep rooted in men which find fertile soil in every circumstance of war; but it can set new ideals and methods before the nation for conserving its most priceless heritage—a clean, healthy, manhood

3. Finally Mr. Baker has given us the encouraging spectacle of a vigorous war secretary not so obsessed by his own department that he cannot see in it a means to the end of peace. He loyally supports the President in his plan of a durable peace based on disarmament and a league of nations. Obviously to institute universal service at this time in America is to discredit our ultimate faith. Mr. Baker's disapproval of the plans of the Security League is most heartening.

Col. Roosevelt and Anarchy

As is well known, the Mooney case in San Francisco has developed an international importance. Of the five defendants in the case, charged with complicity in the Preparedness Day bomb explosion, Mooney himself has been convicted, his wife acquitted, Weinberg acquitted, Billings convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment and Nolan not yet tried. The evidence against all five is or ought to be the same. Respectable investigators, who by no possibility can be accused of being pacifists or anarchists, have brought grave charges against District Attorney Fickert, whose purpose in this case apparently, seems to have been the conviction of certain individuals obnoxious to powerful interests in the city. President Wilson's commission is now investigating the whole matter. In this connection it may be noted that during the recent campaign for the recall of the district attorney, that erstwhile apostle of the recall, ex-president Roosevelt, is quoted by the papers as having sent a telegram containing the following sentences:

"I am informed that an effort is being made to recall you because you have successfully prosecuted the anarchists who during the Preparedness Day parade killed ten persons and injured sixty others.

"If such be the fact, I not only feel that the issue between you and your opponents is that between patriotism and anarchy, but I also feel that all who directly or indirectly assail you for any such reason should be promptly deprived of their citizenship."

This is a very serious addition to the literature of intolerance which is developing so rapidly here in America. The exhortation of leading citizens, clergymen and men in high places to "shoot at sunrise" and "to hang from the nearest lamp-post" those whose opinions they do not like is now strengthened by advice from an ex-president of the United States to disfranchise all those who assail a certain public official, charged with outrageous abuse of his position. No violent demagogue need in the future use any ingenuity in manufacturing phrases wherewith to fire popular violence.

All he needs to do is to keep a card catalogue of the sayings of respectable citizens and use them as occasion demands. When will American leaders and the American public learn that violence and intolerance beget violence and intolerance and nothing else?

The New Orthodoxy

Recently two more clergymen occupying positions of considerable prominence have been added to the ranks of those for whom the church would find no room because of their belief in the incompatibility of war and Christianity: Bishop Paul Jones, of Utah, has been asked to resign by a Committee of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church; and Dr. Ryland, Methodist Superintendent of the Los Angeles District, was removed by Bishop Leonard from the office. Bishop Leonard speaks the mind of the church in these matters: "I desire it understood that I have the highest respect for Dr. Ryland personally. . . . Dr. Ryland told me he would be unable to support my program [of using the church for an aggressive campaign in support of the war]. I then decided to remove him as I feel it a wrong to the church to have a man in the important position of superintendent who is not in sympathy with the government at this hour. I also need in the successful prosecution of my war program a thoroughly sympathetic co-laborer."

The issue here as in most cases is plain. These ministers are of unblemished character, they have served the church well; there is no doubt of their devotion to Christ—they even base their disapproval of war on loyalty to his spirit, but they must go. To the majority of our church people the supreme moral issue is the support of the war, its great agent is the state and for it they are sacrificing as they never dreamt of sacrificing for the Kingdom of God. Perhaps then it is not strange that they cannot tolerate ministers who oppose this passion.

But for the church the situation is full of peril. What becomes of Christ's claims to supremacy in men's hearts and lives if the church makes the final test for her ministers—their loyalty to the policy of a national government? Men are bound to ask: Does the church ask her sons to be loyal to Christ in so far as the state permits or to the state in so far as Christ permits?

There is no more vital question for the Christian. We shall welcome discussion from our readers.

The Destruction of the Poor

The book of Proverbs shrewdly observes that "the destruction of the poor is their poverty." This might serve as a text for the "New York Tribune's" story (December 13th) of the riots to get coal in certain parts of New York. Retailled in small quantities, some times as little as two pounds to a person, coal is estimated to have brought over \$33 a ton. In each case, of course, the poor were the purchasers. Everyone has suffered to some extent from the coal famine, but those who have cellar space and ready money at hand were able in the summer months to lay in something of a supply at fairly reasonable prices. Here again our economic system works out to bring the heaviest pressure of this social calamity upon those who are already poor and undernourished.

Why is it so hard for some of us to realize that to those who cannot afford sufficient food and must buy coal at \$88 a ton mere economic justice means far more than political or international questions.

The A. F. of L. Looks Backward

At a time when development towards internationalism in economic relations is the most imperative need of the world, the American Federation of Labor in its recent convention exhibited an unwarranted recession to nationalism.

This occurred at two points where the action of the Federation is not likely to further even the national interests of the country, much less its international purposes.

For the first time, the Convention went on record in favor of the protection of American industries. Whatever may have been said in favor of such a policy in the past, it is in the present state of world development a plain declaration of economic warfare. The highest development of each of the nations, as well as that of a world order is as dependent upon freedom of exchange in goods as in intellectual and spiritual achievement. The action of the Convention at this point, therefore, was not good patriotism, even for a time of war; for it directly aids the reactionary forces which await the opportunity to annul the course taken by President Wilson in his declaration against exclusive economic leagues.

The second point at which the Convention failed of its opportunity was in its neglect to condemn Mr. Burleson's repressive policy toward the free press of the country. It was here that the lack of statesmanship became most obvious. There was no discrimination in the use which might have been made of labor's power to further both the best interest of the nation and the higher interest of internationalism. The loss of the free press may cost this country its lofty aims in the war. That body of radical opinion, upon whose support the President may need to depend when the time comes for a settlement, will have been disorganized, and its avenues of expression destroyed. Organized labor has so far done little or nothing to conserve that potential power.

The one gleam of hope in all the action of the Conference was its adoption of a report endorsing the Rochdale plan of co-operation and proposing that the Federation appoint a qualified trade-unionist to serve as lecturer and organizer in this field, and recommending further that the local unions each contribute one dollar toward advancing this cause. Hidden in this relatively obscure action may be the seeds of labor's future power in America.

The New British Labor Party

Next to the Russian revolution the most important social event of recent months is the formation of a new labor party in England. It was confidently supposed that the refusal of the British government to grant passports for the Stockholm Socialist Conference, and the consequent withdrawal (or ejection—it depends upon what side you look at it) of Mr. Arthur Henderson from the War Cabinet would lead to a schism in the ranks of organized labor. In point of fact it has had the contrary effect. The newly formed Labor Party in England is the more or less deliberate answer of organized labor to the two great political parties which are now governing England, and it means that the issue is definitely joined between the British proletariat and the aristocratic *bourgeois* classes. One noteworthy circumstance in this new

movement is that its membership is open to all workers, whether they work with their brains or with their hands, and one immediate result has been a very large rallying of professional people to the Labor banner. The Party proposes to contest three hundred industrial constituencies at the next Parliamentary election, and the prospects seem to indicate that it will hold the balance of power in the House of Commons. Alongside the Labor Party the co-operative movement will work in close harmony for the same ends.

Social Unrest in Britain

The announcement of the formation of the New Labor Party in England reaches us almost at the same time as the report of the Committee, appointed by the British Parliament to inquire into the causes of Labor Unrest. It is an extremely significant document. The work of the Committee was divided among eight bodies of commissioners.

The report for the South-Eastern area states the case very plainly.

"The unrest is real, widespread and in some directions extreme, and such as to constitute a national danger unless dealt with promptly and effectively. We are at this moment within view of a possible social upheaval, or at least extensive and manifold strikes. No tinkering schemes will meet the requirements of the situation. It is necessary to secure to the working man a fair share of the product of his labor, and a just participation in the establishment of the conditions of industry. The workmen consider that they should be dealt with as men."

The causes of unrest are divided into those which are local or temporary, and those which are permanent, and it is unanimously agreed that chief among the former are the high prices of food and the accompanying profiteering.

The permanent character of many of the evils complained of is well brought out in the Welsh report. "The conviction that Capital and Labor are necessarily hostile, a conviction engendered by conflict on industrial matters, has been accentuated by the fact that the social conditions of the working classes are of an unsatisfactory character. This fact was brought out by numerous witnesses both on the employers' side and the men's side and there can be no doubt that, although not always expressed, the workers feel deeply discontented with their unwelcome and unattractive environment."

War Incomes in America

With reference to this matter of industrial unrest, a datum from nearer home might not be amiss. This appeared in a New York daily paper on December 3rd.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 3.—The subjoined table shows the increases in the number of large incomes in the last four years, or since income taxes were levied. The table also shows the striking increases since the European war:

Classification	1913	1914	1915	1916
\$100,000 to \$150,000.....	785	1,189	1,793	2,900
\$150,000 to \$200,000.....	311	406	724	1,384
\$200,000 to \$250,000.....	145	233	886	726
\$250,000 to \$300,000.....	94	130	216	427
\$300,000 to \$400,000.....	84	147	254	469
\$400,000 to \$500,000.....	44	69	123	245
Over \$500,000.....	135	174	551	532
Total	1,598	2,348	4,047	6,383

Yet people are asking in an angry and bewildered way what on earth the working man wants. A little study of these figures might shed some light on the problem.

Universal Military Training and World Peace

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

IN that stupendous story of the Great War, *Le Feu*, by Henri Barbusse,* there is a closing chapter of epic grandeur and significance. A remnant of the squad of French soldiers whose endurances, agonies and heroisms make the content of the book, are marooned, as it were, on a little hillock in the midst of a vast sea of mud and filth. The sweeping storm which has obliterated their trenches, scattered their lines, drowned their comrades, and ended temporarily the battle between foe and foe, has beaten down these wretched survivors to the final stages of misery and exhaustion. Danger, however, from the enemy as from the elements, is for the moment passed by, and these guardians of France have time to meditate upon what they have seen and done.

"'War must be killed,' said the first speaker, 'war must be killed in the belly of Germany.'

'There will be no more,' growls a soldier, 'when there is no more Germany.'

'That's not the right thing to say!' cries another. 'It isn't enough. There'll be no more war when the spirit of war is defeated.'

'Germany and militarism,' some one angrily cut in, 'they're the same thing. . . . They are militarism.'

'Militarism'—a soldier began again.

'What is it?' some one asked.

'It's—it's brute force that's ready prepared, and that let's fly suddenly, any minute.'

'Yes. Today militarism is called Germany.'

'Yes, but what will it be called tomorrow?'

'I don't know,' said a voice serious as a prophet's.

'If the spirit of war isn't killed, you'll have struggle all through the ages.'

Several times they repeated, as though feeling their way, 'War must be killed, war itself.'

'That's all silly talk. What diff' does it make whether you think this or that? We've got to be winners, that's all.'

'No!' they clamored, 'To win isn't the object. It isn't those others we've got to get at—it's war.'

'Can't you see that we've got to finish with war? If we've got to begin again some day, all that's been done is no good. . . . It would be two or three years or more of wasted catastrophe.'"

In these scattered fragments of the closing dialogue of *Le Feu*, is revealed the mind which the Great War is more and more producing not only in the fighting men of the French Republic, but in all men everywhere. At the start of the War, selfish, nationalistic interests were predominant.

*"Under Fire" (*Le Feu*) by Henri Barbusse. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. \$1.50 net.

Indeed, I believe that the struggle had its inception, fundamentally speaking, not in the militaristic ambition of any single power, but in the conflicting desires of a group of powers competing through a hundred years of capitalistic development for the political and economic mastery of the modern world. These selfish interests, of which I speak, are still with us in greater or less degrees of influence. In all the belligerent nations there are chauvinists, junkers, imperialists, who seek to crush the enemy at any cost, for the sake of the nationalistic advantages to be gained. But these super-patriots, strong in the beginning, are getting weaker every hour. Already they are frightened at the vast range and power of the destructive forces let loose upon mankind by the fact of war. Already they look upon the spectre of a civilization disrupted and destroyed, with victory unachieved by either side. Like the soldiers at the front, they see with growing clearness "that we've got to finish with war." And thus at last they join hands with those who have proclaimed from the beginning that this must be a war to end war!

What was once a fervent hope is now become in our time a grim resolve. The vast majority of men today in all countries, and of all varieties of opinion, find here a platform upon which they can unite. Non-resistants who will not fight and soldiers whose profession is the sword, pacifists who seek an immediate negotiated peace and militarists who urge haste to the bitter end, Tories who would conserve the institutions and customs of pre-war days and socialists who seek in revolution a new and better social order, all alike understand that at last the delicate and intricate fabric of modern civilization and the enormously destructive agencies of modern warfare, cannot exist together in the same world. One or the other must be destroyed.

And thus the Great War, begun as a struggle between the Central Empires and the Triple Entente, becomes today the final death-grip between the two! Not to win, but to end war, that civilization may be preserved—this is now the supreme object of the fight, alike for England and Germany, for the pacifist who would not have chosen this method of mortal combat and cannot now ac-

cept it as either righteous or efficacious, and the militarist who sees in this method, terrible as it is, the sole process hitherto accepted by nature and by man for the settlement of vast disputes. If a victory is still desired by certain political and social groups on both sides of the battle line, it is only because they regard the triumph of their arms as the one road to enduring peace. If a stalemate and resulting negotiations are accepted with equanimity by other groups on both sides, it is only because they believe that "peace without victory" is the sole outcome which can lead to a permanently ordered world. Peace at any price must be assured, when the fight is done! If not assured, then no victory, however complete, can bring satisfaction even to the victors. "If this isn't the end of it," says the poilu in *Le Feu*, "I'd rather die." But on the other hand, if peace is assured, then may compensation be found even for the unexampled horrors of this vast cataclysm of arms. "If the present (thus) advances progress by one step," says another poilu in the same book, "its miseries and slaughter will count for little."

What is involved in the establishment of an enduring peace, is a problem which may well baffle the ablest and best trained intellects of the contending nations. But that the central issue in this problem is that of universal disarmament, may be asserted without hesitation.

This is not to say that the mere existence of armies and navies is to be regarded in itself as a kind of original, isolated and unrelated *prima causa* of war. It has a nearer relation to this dreadful phenomenon than most persons are willing to admit, even in the face of the present horror in Europe. But while undoubtedly a contributing cause of war, these stupendous, international weapons are at the same time the overt and dramatic expression of other causes, political, economic and ethical in their nature, which are deeply inwrought in the social structure of modern times. It is armies and navies which are the embodiment of that idea of independent and irresponsible national sovereignty, which lies at the root of so much of existing international anarchy. They are the weapons with which imperialistic politicians make good their vindication of national honor, prestige, and ambition. They are the "supports" on which the rival exploiters of each one of the modern capitalistic powers invariably and confidently depend in their campaigns for the possession of foreign markets. And for these very reasons are these armaments, as I have said, the central factor in the great problem of organized peace. They are the talisman, the absence or pres-

ence of which reveals the possibility of international order.

To talk about ending war, as does the League to Enforce Peace, for example, with armies and navies still in the hands and under the arbitrary control of each one of the great powers, is to babble the veriest nonsense. Free trade, free seas, free democracies may all be happily established. World legislatures, executives and courts may be provided for direction of international relationships and settlement of international disputes. War may be made a crime, and laws provided for its punishment as a crime. But if competitive armaments remain, nothing is secure. Just so long as there is a single regiment with which one country may threaten invasion of another, or one squadron of ships with which it may suggest the menace of blockade, so long is war at any moment possible, and sooner or later certain. Indeed, with armaments frowning across boundary lines and water-ways, war is with us always. For an armed peace, such as existed in Europe from 1871 to 1914, is in reality no peace at all. It is only war in a suspended state of animation. Hence the necessity for the abolition of armaments.

This does not mean that by a mere decree abolishing armaments as a magician by a wave of his wand passes material objects into nothingness, the question will be solved. If nothing other than this is done, arms will be speedily improvised for the proper settlement in emergency of a point of honor, or a dispute for profits. With armies and navies must go as well the political and economic imperialisms which use these as offensive weapons; and in their place must be put the international tribunals of judgment and execution by which quarrels between nations may be settled after the pattern of quarrels between individuals. With armies must go autocracies, and in their places come organized and associated democracies. Armaments will be dropped when it is seen, or made, to be safe for such to be dispensed with universally. But for just this reason do they remain the central thing. At once the sign and the thing signified, the disappearance of national armed forces will be the one dramatic feature of the "thousand years of peace," as their presence was the one stupendous feature of the years of "war and rumors of war." Hence the certainty that, in its resolve for enduring peace as a result of the Great War, the modern world is faced with armaments, and the conditions of their revival.

It is from this point of view that the discussion of universal military training, now being precipitated in this country, becomes a

matter of immediate and absorbing importance. And yet it is just this point of view, alone of any real significance today, which is seldom if ever considered by the advocates of this stupendous scheme. By them, the proposal of universal military training is judged and debated exclusively from the standpoint of the United States as a separate and independent nation. It presents, they say, an admirable program for the adequate physical training of our young men. It will achieve a standard of social discipline, the absence of which has long been one of the chief weaknesses of our American democracy! It will provide an ideal method for the assimilation and proper training of our vast immigrant population! It will insure, so far as it can be insured, the maintenance of peace; and in case of war will offer the one perfect defense against invasion and conquest! A hundred and one beneficent things it will do, apparently, for America; but, as though this country were not in any way involved in the human destinies now being wrought out in the furnace-heat of the European conflict, these champions of universal military training never look beyond America and consider the relations of this country to a world struggling for its life. It is as though we were a hermit nation, concerned simply with the task of building a "Great Wall" on the latest twentieth century pattern, for the protection of the realm against invasion!

It is this limited, parochial viewpoint to which the opponent of military training takes most serious and insistent exception at this moment. The beneficent claims put forward on behalf of the scheme win his favor as little today as they did yesterday. Physical training, social discipline, alien assimilation are all excellent, but to be furthered by methods far more direct and effective than any method based on the militarization of our citizenship. Hope of security against war as a result of preparedness for war, has been made ridiculous by the great cataclysm of 1914. The only shred of an argument for universal military training which is respectable, is that the plan will provide us with a great army of trained men for the war which may sooner or later follow upon the close of the present conflict. But—it is just this next war, which the present war is being fought out at an unimaginable cost of lives and of money, in order to make impossible! On their own confession, the allied powers are battling for a world which shall be henceforth secure from the intolerable menace of arms. They are sacrificing everything to bring

out of this war a peace that shall endure. Especially is this the confession of America. Again and again has President Wilson laid down the dictum that we have joined the fight only "to make the world safe for democracy." If the guarantee of peace is not to follow this war, then is the war in vain, and the utterances of our President as words spoken in the wind!

It is because of this fact that the good citizen of this country, be he militarist or pacifist, a champion of war to victory or of a negotiated peace, must refuse to consider universal military training in America from any other point of view than that of its international consequences. And it is because of these consequences that he insists upon its abandonment, or at least postponement, for the present. All that is said in favor of the scheme by its most ardent champions may be true. This may be admitted for the sake of argument. But such contentions are not valid at this vast moment of human destiny. Nothing counts today but the ending of this war on conditions which shall mark the ending of all war for all time. To the accomplishment of this end, America is dedicated, if her present leaders are to be trusted. For the accomplishment of this end, America must come to the council chamber in which final peace negotiations will be considered, fitted to work and plead. She must stand there with open and clean hands, stripped of selfish ambitions, naked of all fear and distrust of the world, entitled to confidence by right of confidence bestowed. And this means that she must be unencumbered by a recently adopted policy of universal training, destined by its very nature to make her the greatest military power that the world has ever known.

If there is any one thing that will defeat the hope now cherished by mankind of securing an enduring peace as the compensation of present losses and agonies, it is the deliberate adoption by America in the midst of this vast undertaking, of such a military program. It will advertise to all the world that she has no real confidence that this war will bring what it is supposed to bring. It will proclaim that she recognizes nations across the sea whom she has reason to distrust and fear not today but tomorrow. Worst of all, it will in the good old way, illustrated by a hundred international tragedies, arouse in other nations distrust and fear against herself.

At this moment the most potent agency for peace that shall endure forever, America will become at once, through the adoption of universal military

training, the most potent agency for war that shall recur forever. In spite of herself, just because of her illimitable resources, her geographical isolation and her comparative immunity from destructive and exhausting losses even in the case of an indefinite prolongation of the present struggle, America will take the unlovely place hitherto occupied by Germany as the military pace-maker and therefore menace of the world. And all without reason! For even the most ardent champions of universal military training urge this scheme at bottom only in the name of adequate defense! But which one of them all does not know that next year, or two years hence, whenever the end of this vast struggle has at last come, America by virtue of the present unheard of creation of vast armaments, will be protected against invasion beyond all immediate necessity of further far-flung schemes of militarization. Her navy and draft armies are ample security against a ravaged world, at least until such time as we discover that the hopes of men are blasted, and the old race of competitive armaments has again been started.

The proposal for military training is at this moment, therefore, both unnecessary and vicious. Fortunate is it for this nation and for the world that President Wilson and Secretary of War Baker see this with clear vision and therefore set their faces like flint against the scheme.

"The department has not sought, and does not now seek, legislation on the subject," says Mr. Baker, in his annual report, "chiefly for the reason that the formation of permanent military policy will inevitably be affected by the arrangement consequent upon the termination of the present war. Civilized men must hope that the future has in store a relief from the burden of armament and the destruction and waste of war.

"However vain that hope may appear in the midst of the most devastating and destructive war in the history of the race, it persists—perhaps because we are encouraged by the analogous substitution of courts for force in the settlement of private controversies; perhaps because all the perfections of nature teach us that they are the product of processes which have eliminated waste and substituted constructive for destructive principles.

"When a permanent military policy, therefore, comes to be adopted it will doubtless be conceived in a spirit which will be adequate to preserve against any possible attack those vital principles of liberty upon which democratic institutions are based, and yet be so restrained as in no event to foster the growth of mere militarist ambitions, or to excite

the apprehension of nations with whom it is our first desire to live in harmonious and just accord."

It is for this reason, and on this line, that the present campaign for universal military training in this country must be fought and defeated. That this war, even as interpreted by militarists, may not miss its goal, and "these dead have died in vain!" When, or if, this end of what may seem to be an enduring peace is reached, we shall, of course, have to begin the fight all over again. The militarist, like the poor, we "have always with us." This fairest hope of an ordered and happy world will be deliberately blasted, if it be possible, by these fanatics of the sword. But the fight can then be lifted to higher levels of thought and feeling than are now at all possible. Brotherhood, goodwill, "the sword of the spirit," will again become words to conjure with.

For the present, however, we must meet these wreckers of the Kingdom in the midst of the ruin which they have wrought in blindness and unbelief. Even in the midst of their own fell slaughter, they prate of peace. In spite of themselves do they thus pay homage to God and to the ineradicable instincts of divinity within men's hearts. And we must take them at their word—prevent them from undoing the very thing that they would do, by defeating universal military training in America as the one most serious threat today against the hope that "somehow good will be the better part of ill" in this Great War.

Nationalism versus Christianity

"The real source of the war is the proposition that we owe a boundless devotion to our own country, and nothing whatever to any other country but our own. Nationalism, in a degree, is a very desirable thing, but it differs from any other form of *esprit de corps* in that it implies or permits a suspension of the moral law. We must get people to feel that there is something higher than the loyalty to their own country—there is an obligation to the interests of all mankind. This doctrine is one of the most elementary tenets of Christianity. The doctrine of the brotherhood of man is taught by every religious denomination in the world. I should like to see a very resolute effort made by the ministers of all denominations of Christianity to enforce the doctrine not only that war is inconsistent with Christianity, but that nationalism is inconsistent with Christianity. We want to get behind the idea that the higher loyalty is to our own country, to the idea that all men are brethren, and that we owe to them a duty of inexhaustible, immeasurable love."

LORD HUGH CECIL, M.P.



“Behold, I stand at the door and knock”—January, 1918

A new version of Holman Hunt, by Boardman Robinson

The Seeds of War in the Social Order

WILLARD L. SPERRY

THE Great War has already become the major fact in our world, dominating not only the present but the future. As the political ingenuity and the economic resources of the next quarter of a century have now been mortgaged in advance to meet the material cost of the War, so, also, the spiritual and moral resources of Christendom are committed to the effort to discover the causes of the War and to attack this problem at its source.

Our Common Guilt

The candid and earnest mind can no longer be satisfied with the accounts of the immediate origin of the War given in its opening days. We can no longer dismiss this tragedy as an unhappy accident in no way connected with the general conceptions of life held and practiced by the great majority of the citizens of the modern world. Neither our historical sense nor our moral sense can be appeased by laying the great burden of guilt upon the shoulders of a single Serbian assassin. Nor can we shrive our souls by attributing the War to a single false move or a series of false moves in the game of international diplomacy. Had the various State papers been played differently the War might have been temporarily avoided, but it could not have been ultimately averted. Nor can the War be laid solely at the door of the "governmental mind." The governors of Christendom may have overstepped their prerogatives, but in the main they have reflected and given expression to the popular mind. Nor was the War the evil fruit of the labors of any single thinker or school of thought. We cannot single out some one erratic and offending philosopher like Nietzsche and lay upon him the sins of us all and send him off into exile as the vicarious victim of our corporate stupidity and perversity. Self respect and sincerity forbid these facile explanations of the Great War.

"Looking back," writes Canon Streeter, of Oxford, "we can all see that the moral and political ideas of Europe being what they were the catastrophe was inevitable. It is to the moral stagnation of Europe that the War is due. I do not mean to say that there has been no ethical advance in the last hundred years—the contrary is true. But in those same hundred years the advance in knowledge, in invention, in organization, in the con-

trol of nature has been beyond all precedent; and compared with that advance the ethical movement has been relatively stagnant. It is true of our present, as of older civilizations that its fall—for it is falling and the conclusion of peace will not be the end of its collapse—is due to inner moral bankruptcy."

This is the sober conclusion to which every serious minded man is today being forced. There is no scapegoat, either a single man or group of men, on whom we may lay the moral responsibility for the War, sending him off into the wilderness of sin, and comfortably relapsing ourselves into moral complacency and inertia. Each one of us must for himself make his own penitential pilgrimage into the bleak desert of sombre and disconcerting facts which lie behind the War. The sins which we have done in common we must repent of one by one. The moral hope of Christendom lies not with the clever Pharisee who gives thanks that he is not as those philosophers and rulers, but with the penitent publican upon whom the corporate guilt of the time lies heavy as a personal burden, and who prays in humility and sincerity, "God, be merciful to me a sinner."

The Universal Spirit of Anti-Christ

If there is one general fact more than any other to which the War may be attributed it is to the prevalence in the world of a spirit which bears the traditional name, "Anti-Christ."

This term comes to us from an ancient and obscure philosophy of history, which has, nevertheless, remarkable vitality, and which is always revived in every time of great catastrophe.

It comes to us from the theory of history current in Jesus' day among the Jews. Before the Kingdom of Heaven can come, said the ancient Jew, there must be a preliminary and final struggle between the powers of good and evil in the present world. The powers of good will rally to the standard of the Messiah-to-be. The powers of evil, no longer scattered and ineffectual, will gather under the guidance of one, Anti-Christ. Armageddon, the last moral struggle before the dawning of the new order, will be the final frank collision between religion and irreligion.

While very few of us hold to the letter of this program there is a permanent religious and his-

torical truth in it. No new order can be born without some preliminary travail. And no Utopia can be achieved unless the moral issues of the present order have been absolutely clarified and satisfactorily solved. In the broad sense of the word, therefore, the appearance of Anti-Christ is a necessary part of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.

There can be no denying that the last few years have seen the growth and spread of a scheme of life frankly un-Christian. Most of us can remember the outrage to our unsuspecting consciences, when first we were confronted with this unashamed and aggressive spirit of Anti-Christ in the modern world. Many philosophers and statesmen and soldiers in recent years have openly repudiated the whole Christian morality, and announced themselves as the disciples of this hostile and alien morality.

What is this spirit of a private and public ethic which in these latest days has come into keen self-consciousness and into tragic prominence in history? It is the spirit of studied egoism, of ruthless self-assertion, of resolute and pitiless self-will which seems to be the genius of the animal man. Its rule of life is the holy necessity of self-realization without fear or respect of others. Its method is the never ending, ever renewed struggle for existence waged within the human species by fierce, fratricidal competition. The justification of its faith and practice, with the inevitable by-products of cruelty and misery, is found in its central dogma that it is the sacred duty of the fit to survive and the tragic destiny of the unfit to perish. Here you have the sabre-toothed tiger become morally self-conscious and turned fanatic. The prophets and priests of this religion of Anti-Christ repudiate the "slave-morality" of Christianity, with its weak pity, its suicidal altruism, choosing rather to regard themselves as the chosen vessels and vehicles of the imperious Will-to-Live and the ruthless Will-to-Power.

It is the rapid spread of this point of view which gives to the War its profounder moral significance. The War has taken this spirit, which was unconsciously latent and operative in our whole social order, and has suddenly brought it to keen self-consciousness, and fanatical propagandism. It is this spirit which is the occasion of modern Belgium and Poland and Serbia.

It is, however, utterly impossible to isolate this spirit of Anti-Christ in any one locality and confine it to any one state. Some modern states have

had the sincerity frankly to repudiate the Christian ethic as being inconsistent with their national ambition and policy, and to espouse as their genius this other ethic. Some war-lords seem to have had the courage of their un-Christian creeds and codes more boldly than others. But all modern nations alike, belligerent and neutral, are permeated with this point of view, and are at present involved in the moral struggle which the collision of these two cultures involves. Rupert Brooke said, "Well, if Armageddon's on, I suppose one might as well be there." Whether we realize it or not, we are all at Armageddon today, facing the issues of this moral conflict. And the Christian's real foes, today, are not those of another race or state. They are those of his own household, who under the pressure of events find themselves forced by the logic of their own lives and circumstance, to confess that they are not with Christ but with Anti-Christ.

We here in America need to realize that we cannot be neutral upon this problem. We cannot dismiss the spirit of Anti-Christ as a European phenomenon merely. If the apostles of Anti-Christ are marching back and forth across modern Europe in terrible dramatization of their faith, the same spirit is also sitting in our own counting houses, shrieking aloud in our stock exchanges, winning its victories on our ticker tapes, and peopling our mills and mines and slums with its victims. This evil genius of an un-Christian attitude toward life is the same in the Colorado mines and the New England mills and on the New York curb that it is in Belgium. It can work out its sinister purposes with a pay roll quite as effectively as with a machine gun or a submarine. It can kill a man as dead with a starvation wage as with a piece of shrapnel shell. It can mutilate childhood as effectively with a loom as with a bayonet. It can prostitute womanhood as shamelessly in a department store as in a military brothel. Its atrocities in war differ from its atrocities in peace not in kind, but only in degree. It is not, therefore, Anti-Christ in Europe which concerns the sober American half so much as Anti-Christ in his own country and his own city; yes, nigh him in his own heart. The War has made us all freshly conscious of the un-Christian impulses buried deep in our own lives. So an American poet says:

"Then I looked in my own breast,
And I said, What war is this that I am bitter against?
Behold the lyddite in my soul, that destroys peace
about me.
Behold the bayonet of my hate, and the shrapnel
of my bestiality;

The contending armies of lusts and shames and intrigues;
The sentries of dark sins, the spies of despalis;
In this little world of self I saw the big;
In my own breast I found war and disaster and ship
sinking,
The death of faith and hope.
Behold in myself I found Man . . .
Who since the beginning has been this advancing
conflict,
Ever thus."

"If we are to profit by the lessons of this fearful bloodshed, clearly we must begin by realizing that war simply gives startling emphasis to conditions of life and action that form the norm of so-called Christian countries in times of peace. We war because we live to get; we oppress by force of arms because we oppress by the selfishness and self-interest of our social and economical life; we kill with shot and shell in war because we kill by callousness, lovelessness, treachery and self-seeking in times of peace. What advantageth it for a man to refuse to go abroad to fight so that he remains at home to oppress or disregard the sufferings of his brother? Where is the glory of knitting socks in the name of Christ for those who fight abroad, whilst content to behold our brethren at home unshod and unclothed? Or to send food to fighting armies whilst untouched by the sight, grown familiar, of hungering armies of unemployed at home? Trampling the Sermon on the Mount underfoot! Since when has the corporate Christian conscience—as distinct from the individual—done anything else with it at home in our times."*

The Great War wheels about upon every one of us in his unconscious Pharisaism with its blunt pitiless accusation, "Thou art the man!" And the Kingdom of God can never come on earth until men refuse to be diverted from the real issue to time-service of Leagues for Peace, and grapple with the more intimate problem of the fundamentally un-Christian dispositions and methods of their own lives.

It is to some such conviction that the modern Christian has been forced by the irresistible logic of his own thought during the last few years. The problem of War and Peace must be attacked at its sources and the Institution of War overcome not by pruning it from the top, but rather by discovering and removing the germinating seeds of war in the social order.

*"War and the Christian Ethic." P. Gavan Duffy, *International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1917.

(The second part of this article will appear in the next issue of "The New World.")

The Conviction of the Christian Pacifists

Religious Liberty On Trial

On December 6th a jury in the Los Angeles police courts found Rev. Robert Whitaker, Rev. Floyd Hardin, and Harold Story (a young Quaker) guilty of "unlawful assembly, failure to disperse, and disturbing the peace."

This case which has attracted wide attention on the Pacific Coast, bids fair to be of vital significance for the cause of religious liberty. Whitaker, Hardin, and Story were leaders of a group of men and women who attempted on the first three days in October to hold a conference for prayer and discussion. The name "Christian Pacifists" indicated their position, but the program was definitely planned on the religious rather than the political plane. Popular sentiment was stirred against them; they had great trouble in securing a hall; finally they gathered in the Douglas Building. The police appeared and arrested the leaders while the audience was repeating the Twenty-third Psalm. The meeting continued after the departure of the prisoners. No further arrests were made though the group was driven to meet in private houses and its final session was roughly broken up by the mob led by "Home Guards."

The Rev. Billy Sunday, then conducting a revival in Los Angeles, threw the weight of his influence and that of the Church on the side of the mob. He declared (unless reports belie him), "I'll tell you what I would do with those obstructionists. I'd hang them to a tree as they did at Butte, and let the coroner do the rest." However the people of various communities whose fellow townsmen had attended the conference were less ferocious than Mr. Sunday. They contented themselves with expelling those who were pastors from their churches, and with other similar manifestations of displeasure. From the imperfect reports that have as yet reached us it appears that the atmosphere of the trials was scarcely judicial. For example, the judge permitted a picture to be taken of a large delegation of G. A. R. veterans seated in the courtroom. Everything was done to make the issue one of disloyalty to America.

We understand the case will be appealed if funds, which are urgently needed, can be raised. Contributions may be sent to Roger Baldwin, Director of the Civil Liberties Bureau, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York. We cannot believe a higher court will uphold this decision.

The issue is so serious as to require more extended comment than is now possible. Not these men but the American conception of religious liberty is on trial. Does our liberty simply mean that we are free to agree with the government? The Roman Empire granted as much to the Early Christians. These men may have been right or they may have been wrong in their interpretation of Christianity—were they to be allowed no chance to discuss it? Were they to be arrested on suspicion of unlawful assembly even before they had spoken? Surely these questions are of the most serious moment to the American people, most of all to those who have gloried in the exercise of the right of the human soul to worship God according to the dictates of the individual conscience.

The Negro and the War

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

WHAT will the war do for the negro? Will it result in a further enslavement to race prejudice or in the breaking of some of his fetters of caste, the removal of some of the grave disadvantages under which he labors? These questions have been eagerly asked by thoughtful colored Americans since the beginning of the war, and with rising hopes as they read of colored Africans fighting in the trenches, of the bravery of the French irregular negro troops, of the tens of thousands of South African laborers doing vitally necessary work on the docks and close behind the trenches, and of the achievements of Chinese workmen and of the Japanese navy. They have hoped that the white men who are fighting for the destruction of militarism and the extension of democracy would find in this new comradeship with men of other colors, and in this fresh demonstration that on the battlefield there are no differences between men who fight for the same aims, an incentive to let them enter into full brotherhood when the struggle is over.

This hope is well founded if our purpose is sincere, and if we are, through this war, forever to put an end to the imposition of the will of a stronger nation upon a weaker. For if the Allies win—and triumph their ideals will, even if luck should again prove to favor the larger battalions—it should never be possible to witness again such crimes as have been committed upon the dark men of Africa by the colonizing forces of Germany—who drove no less than thirty thousand Herreros, men, women and children, into the desert to die of thirst, and thereby gave us a warning as to what was to come in Belgium and Northern France—or by those of France in Madagascar and of Great Britain in various quarters of the globe. With the ending of this idea that might makes right—which the Germans have revealed to the world in all its moral nakedness—and with the freeing—let us hope—of all disadvantaged races from further “civilizing” by German or any other *Kultur*, there should come at once a vast improvement in the status of colored peoples. Certainly if there is any sanity left in the world after this terrible epoch, no one will desire to precipitate a new world war with the line of cleavage one of color. Those cartoons we have all seen of the heathen, dark-skinned nations of the globe watching with amazement the Christian nations seeking to destroy themselves by

every kind of battle fiendishness, carry an emphatic lesson of warning. If the world is not to be an armed camp it must certainly find a new policy to pursue towards the colored people lest there be a league of peoples in the East to offset any league of nations in the West.

While such fundamental thoughts are running through mens’ brains, what in our narrower American sphere has the war so far done for the colored citizen of the United States? Whether we believe or not that in the long run good can come out of war, we must admit that the economic disarrangement of this country due to the war, has incidentally and accidentally, improved the status of the negro. Not since emancipation, I believe, has anything so benefitted the negro in the South as the migration of colored people from the Southern States during the last two years. Whether this is a purely economic reaction to the law of supply and demand in the field of labor, or whether it is primarily a flight out of bondage will doubtless be a sore puzzle for its historian in the future. To-day we must frankly admit that mixed motives have entered in. The lure of high wages or of equal wages in a section where negroes can at least vote and can educate their children has doubtless played a part, but no mere additional pecuniary reward for labor could induce hundreds of thousands to cut loose from lifelong ties, to leave the huts they call home, to bid farewell to kindred in a migration so sudden in many places as to savor of panic.

When people abandon farms and leave their utensils and their tools in kitchen and shed, without even waiting to put out the red flag of the auctioneer, there is something more at stake than a higher wage. Nor is it without significance that the exodus has been most marked in certain States in those counties in which lynchings have most frequently occurred, where the midnight gallows, and the medieval stake with its horrible burning alive, have shocked to the core. Black men read nowadays; they have begun to think even in the South. They are no longer mere tools, mere subjects of the superior race. There is stirring within them not only class consciousness, but a knowledge that what they endure is not endured elsewhere; that there is a way of escape; that there still shines for them a North Star as in the days when the boldest slaves, hunted by hounds and trailed by day and night, waded upstream and hid in caves

and high branches, but ever pushed onward toward that North light with its intangible yet most tangible Mason and Dixon's line.

Now the fact is that this migration is not without cost. The emigrants arrive in strange cities, to find no housing, no adequate reception, no guides to tell them where to go and where to find work. They are easy prey to the cold and to disease. This is the price they pay that their fellows left behind may profit, and profiting they are. For they have worked a revolution by their exodus. They have made the South suddenly realize that its wonderful supply of labor is no longer to be had merely for the asking; that it must be bid for as other sections of our Union bid for labor by better wages, better living conditions, fairer treatment, fairer prospects, fairer hopes that the children may do more and be more than their parents.

It is a new emancipation, and the evidences of it are on every hand. Southern newspaper editors come to me and say that conditions must be bettered in their South, that they see now that a different policy must prevail. They are beginning to say this in their journals. It seems really incredible that there has been in the South where this terrible problem is so fraught with difficulties and disadvantages for both races, no steering committees in each community to adjust relations, to smooth over difficulties, to remove rough edges, to counsel together, each admitting its faults in recognition of the fact that both sides are human, and that ways must be found of living together in amity when the juxtaposition is there and not to be ended—but such has been the fact. Only now do we hear of get-together meetings, of gatherings of the wise men of both colors to consult upon the situation and to talk frankly. In Memphis, to mention only one city, there have been such assemblages, and best of all the colored people have spoken right out. The old fear to tell the whole truth lest they be written down as upstart and dangerous “niggers” getting “too uppity” has passed, and so the colored delegates have been telling the whole story of the discriminations against their race in court, the wickedness of much of the sentencing to the chain gang, and how that chain gang forever ruins those first offenders sent to it, who might be redeemed if only they were received in the spirit of Him who said “Suffer little children to come unto me”—since most of these juvenile offenders are but children. They have spoken of the schools, how totally inadequate they are and how many children—five thousand in Atlanta—are doomed to the streets without hope of learning even their letters, to be branded as

“just naturally niggers” if in this environment and this ignorance they grow up criminals. And in every case the whites have listened and could not deny the truth, and have promised that conditions shall be mended.

It is sad, of course, that we have had to await the touching of the pocket-nerve, but let us thank heaven that whatever the reason, the consciousness is spreading that these black men and women are to be looked at differently now that they are twice armed with knowledge and economic power. So we hear of white women speeding colored men of the draft and *serving food* to them as they left; of other whites organizing to care for the negro families left behind; of many a similar movement that has nothing to do with the forming of our armies but does illustrate the growing recognition that whether we like it or not, both races are together here for time eternal and that it is the part of charity, humanity, justice and democracy to deal with the disadvantaged ones in the spirit of good will and of fellowship.

Surely all of this wonderful change, which I have thus too briefly indicated, brightens the whole race outlook ineffably. It does not wipe out the shame and disgrace of East St. Louis, or of the steadily recurring inquisitorial pyre. It does not relieve us of the duty of crying out against these horrors with all the power that lies within us. Duty to America, duty to our country's avowed aims in the struggle before us, compel us to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth about them—that they are worse than any of the horrors that have come to us from across the seas, from pitiful Belgium and more pitiful Armenia, at the very mention of which every true American heart leaps with grief and pity. We shall be unpardonable if we do not strain more than ever to free our country's escutcheon from these stains. I have lived in Berlin and read the comments in peace times of the German press upon these barbarities at home; more than ever now I do not want the Germans to excuse their barbarities by pointing the finger of scorn at us, and saying “Thou, too.”

But there have been other momentous happenings to make all of us rejoice who have the negro's welfare at heart. One of the most notable actions taken by the American Federation of Labor at its recent meeting in Buffalo was its decision to strike down the color line in Union labor circles and to organize the negro workingmen who for them, too, have until now been beyond the pale. This, also, was not due to any altruistic motive. It was forced by the growing numbers of negro workingmen

in the North, by the fear that they would be more than ever used as strikebreakers and by the recognition that these black men, so long slighted, could no longer be ignored because they were rising so fast in the social and industrial scale as to be counted upon by the nation in half a dozen different ways as a special reliance in the field and in various war industries. But whatever the motive, let us rejoice over this long step forward in the recognition of the industrial equality of the negro. Undoubtedly, the migration from the South had its effects here, too.

Even more important than this has been the most momentous Supreme Court decision in the history of the negro race since that of *Dred Scott*—that of making it impossible to establish in any American city segregation for the blacks—I had almost said ghettos for the Jews as well, because, if the principle of segregation were written on our statute books, it might only have been a matter of time when it would have been applied to other races than the negro of whose presence we are not—some of us, that is,—enamored. But the Supreme Court, which we have often had to doubt, some of whose decisions have made us hang our heads, stood fast this time and to its honor be it said, every member of the Court, Southerners and Northerners, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for this epoch-making decree, and overnight there fell crashing down in Richmond, in Norfolk, in Louisville, in St. Louis, in a dozen other cities, the hateful barriers of oppression, just as they went down in Czardom when the Revolution made the Pale a thing of the past.

When it is remembered that this same Supreme Court of ours laid down in the *Berea* case, according to Justice Brewer, a doctrine of race separation, which would have made it possible—I use Justice Brewer's words—to regulate the hours during which Jewish citizens of the United States could appear in any market-place in any city in this land—it is plain indeed that America does move as well as the world as a whole. There ought to be *Te Deums* in every negro church in America when this old year 1917 goes out for this glorious decision, the far-reaching effect of which few of our editors and public men are aware.

I do not find it as easy to become enthusiastic about what the United States has done for the colored soldier. The War Department had not thought of a training camp for colored officers until the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—to which belongs also the honor of obtaining the segregation decision—forced the

idea upon the Department's attention. Grudgingly some six hundred and twenty-six officers were commissioned from this camp in addition to a hundred medical officers. This is a far smaller number of officers of their own race than the eighty-three thousand six hundred conscripts are entitled to. The one colored man of Colonel's rank was hastily placed upon the retired list when war broke out; not one of these new officers is above the rank of captain, and it is still doubtful whether the War Department is not a good deal more interested in getting colored stevedores than colored soldiers. No one has suggested making white stevedore regiments out of the drafted men, but if Secretary Baker's self-defense in this matter is interpreted aright, it would appear that only thirty thousand men of the eighty-three thousand six hundred drafted are to be soldiers. The rest are to be laborers apparently.

All of this is not encouraging our colored citizens any more than the savage discipline of the rioters of the Twenty-fourth Infantry with its bloody toll of thirteen hanged and forty-one sentenced to imprisonment for life has convinced them that an even-handed justice dealt with these blood-stained, but terribly scorned and outraged, men. The colored people know, too, that in the South the draft law was not fairly executed; they laugh at its boasted democracy when they point to their segregation in our camps and our regiments. The War Department cannot yet clear itself of half-heartedness and weakness in dealing with phases of this army question, but since the crumbs that have come are from the table of an Administration which began by segregating the negro in the Washington Department, and has in five years never spoken out once against lynching or against the East St. Louis barbarities, or recognized in any way the existence of a negro problem, we must perhaps be duly thankful that it has seen the light to this extent.

By preference, finally, the mind goes back to that wonderful migration with all that it foretells of race solidarity and consciousness. It has been without leadership or organized propaganda; an undefined psychology has played a wonderful part; the weight of government has been thrown against it; men have been arrested for attempting to leave; others for advocating or urging migration, or offering inducements. It is far beyond and above any one reason or cause; it is an *hegira*; an *exodus*. "And Moses said unto the people, 'Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from this place.'"

The Kingdom of God Is At Hand

W. E. ORCHARD

THE Kingdom of God is at hand." It always is; so near that a man could put out his hand and bring it from heaven to earth. But surely only for himself? No. No man can taste the Kingdom of God for himself only. The moment one soul can establish contact with the Divine Order, its forces break through him and on along those hidden channels, often so unsuspected and unused, which link soul to soul, until the vision flashes in on every mind, and every heart is touched with the power of God.

Why then does the Kingdom tarry? Why are the peoples still enthralled by delusions, obsessed by fear, plagued by suffering, held in bondage to sin? What separates us from realizing the happiness and freedom, the holiness and joy for which our hearts were made, for which inwardly we long? It is nothing in God. There is no procrastination in His love, no unconcern in His watchful care, He is ever seeking to save us from ourselves and from the fatal consequences of our folly and rebellion. It is not inherent to the Divine purpose for the world that we should wait through all these weary centuries. The evolution of things is not pre-terminately slow; and the Kingdom of God is not merely the evolution of things, nor does it wait upon them. What is called evolution is often merely a complication of external things, bringing to the awakened soul ever new possibilities of happiness and power, perhaps stirring unawakened souls to face anew their unfulfilled natures and the unrealized intention of their lives, but of itself neither creating nor hindering blessedness. Since the time of Abraham, of Christ, of the Middle Ages, the mode of thought, custom and the organization of life have changed as if humanity had moved on to another world. Yet the literature of the Old Testament, of the New, of mediaeval mysticism stands to witness how much the soul has remained the same through all external changes, some living in the light of God, some in the outer darkness. There was nothing in circumstances, nothing in the course of things then to prevent the Kingdom coming, to prevent the will of God being done on earth as it is in heaven; there is nothing now. There will always be room for progress in the Kingdom, place for deepening of the mind, space for the exploration of the Divine, interest in the intrication of life. But progress is not itself the Kingdom nor does the

Kingdom depend upon it. The Kingdom is always at hand.

Yet our hearts may beat more quickly at the thought to-day, and we may proclaim the eternal truth with greater confidence, not because the hour is auspicious, not because the march of progress has at last carried us over the last hill of darkness to see the eternal plains and the immortal sea lie stretched before us; but just because all around us men are saying, "This is not the hour," and just because in their hearts some are crying, "This is the hour of darkness." "For in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh."

Just because civilization has suddenly revealed its insincerities, its instability, its dependence upon force, its sanction of wholesale brutality and bloody murder, its awful adaptability to destruction; just because education is seen to have taught us the repression rather than the extinction of envy, hate, lying, craftiness, passion, so that a century of culture has done nothing to improve the savage out of us; just because progress in science, organization, government is found to be as fine a weapon for evil as for good (it seems to work even more swiftly and smoothly for evil); because of all this laid bare by the world of war, we can lift our heads and assure our hearts that our redemption draweth nigh. For we can comfort ourselves with the evident conviction of Christ that any great catastrophe brings the Kingdom of God nearer; not only because we trust His faith and insight, but because we also can see how the sudden disturbance of the outward order helps to throw men back upon the spiritual and eternal. There is nothing antagonistic to the Kingdom in civilization, progress, or the organization of life; it is only when these things are identified with or substituted for the Kingdom that their destruction may be needed. If to Jesus the destruction of Jerusalem was only a prelude to His coming in His Kingdom, then the destruction of the kingdoms of this world in such measure as is going on now, must be the promise of His still more glorious coming.

In some of us a realization of the Kingdom has already quickened, deepened, or come into overwhelming fashion since the war broke out. Our interpretation of this war as the judgment of God upon us all, rather than upon one nation, class or policy; our inability to take any part in its prosecution, however right or wrong we may be judged to

be, has undoubtedly brought to us a revelation of the vaster meaning of our faith, a new sense of the eternal wisdom of Christ's Cross, and an unshakable assurance of God. What are most of us seeking now? We are seeking for some means to express our faith. Words are no longer enough. A new order of life is both the need forced upon us from without and the drive of own desires. It is possible for us now if ever to begin to build up life on a basis which shall set forth the Christian faith more eloquently than a system of theology, however sound, or a style of preaching, however sincere; something which would carry its message with power to the world even though we were all dumb; a society which in its basis and ordering sets forth Christ and Him crucified; a sacrificial society. Once again Christianity must become not a sentiment, a theory of life, a temper of mind, a type of character only, but a way of life. We must be able to say not only, "If this can happen, if men can live like this, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you." Men shall not ask how or when, for the Kingdom of God shall be in their midst.

A Christian "Stockholm"

Through recent issues of English papers we get news of the beginning of a hopeful effort to make the brotherhood of Christian believers an actuality. We quote part of the statement of the British Council for Promoting an International Christian Meeting, signed by a number of representative religious leaders, including the Dean of St. Paul's:

"The Council consists of men and women of very varied religious and political opinions. Their object is to promote a purely religious meeting which will discuss neither the causes of the war, nor the political conditions of peace, but which will demonstrate the true unity which even in the midst of this bitter conflict unites all Christians in allegiance to their common Master. It is thought that if belligerents and neutrals could meet in prayer together, they might help to create the atmosphere which is essential if the Governments of the nations are to conclude and to preserve a just and lasting peace.

"The same thoughts seem to be stirring in other nations, for an invitation has just been received from Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden (a well known leader, even before the war, in the cause of Christian unity) and Bishop Ostenfeld of Denmark, and Bishop Tandberg of Norway, to a Christian Conference at Upsala on December 14th, of belligerents and neutrals. We are grateful for the spirit shown by this invitation, but we fear that the time is too short to organize a Conference which would be really representative. The British Council hopes, however, to go on preparing the way for such a meeting, to be held whenever the right time may arrive, and we ask all Christians to join us in prayer for this object."

We expect that the American Branch of the Alliance of Churches for Promoting International Friendship will lend its weight to American participation in such a movement.

Already the Socialists have put the Church to shame by their attempt at an international conference in the interests of reconciliation while Christians were silent. We are profoundly thankful that something has been begun which may take from us the reproach of our continuing silence.

The Library

"THE OUTLOOK FOR RELIGION, BY W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. (Funk & Wagnalls, \$1.50 net).

If criticism and quotation are the main functions of a book reviewer, the writer of this review is doomed to failure. He cannot criticize because his wholehearted approval of this searching analysis of the outlook for religion and in particular for the Christian Church sweeps him away from the critical attitude. He cannot quote because to do that at all adequately or even to give some idea of the flavor of the author's style would be to quote page after page of a book which holds one's attention not merely by the quality of its thought, but by the excellence of its expression. This review then must be an exhortation. Here is a book which every thoughtful person, especially every thoughtful Christian, must read.

These are days when many so-called religious writings will not bear analysis. They may be sincere but they are astonishingly superficial. Preachers and writers in one breath admit that war is hell and in the next they go on to praise *this* war as "the way of Christ" and "the method whereby nations are finding their souls." They take comfort to themselves because "you can scarcely find an irreligious man in the trenches." But is *their* religion Christian? How far is it superstitious or fatalistic? Is the hell of war that sure road to the heart of God which some would have us believe it to be? The church has won golden opinions for its patriotism, but will patriotism alone save the church or justify Christianity—even patriotism for a high cause? It is questions like these that Dr. Orchard considers with a wealth of illustration, under such heads as: "Will there be any religion left?" "What kind of religion will it be?"—"What type of Christianity will persist?"

The second division of the book begins with a chapter on the "Demand for Reality." How little Dr. Orchard himself fears to try to face that demand is proved by his chapter on the "Perils of Pacifism," a chapter which many of the readers of this magazine will doubtless find the most striking of all. His closely knit argument suffers from fragmentary quotation, yet one cannot forbear the risk in order to indicate something of the thought of the author.

"When one sees how the doctrine of immortality and 'bright views of death' are used to enable us to submit to this daily murder of Europe's finest youth; how the fading ideals of war are recolored with the blood of Christ; how false hopes of what war can accomplish are encouraged by pointing to the Cross; no one can be surprised if it comes to be thought that Christianity is the greatest obstacle to the deliverance of man from bewildering superstition and misleading ideals."

"Yet there are a few, of whom the writer must count himself as one, to whom the war has lit up Christianity to its very depths, renewed their faith in Christ as the absolute truth about God and man, shown that the way of His Cross is the only wisdom and the only effective power for the redemption of the world, and quickened the demand for that one Church of many members which shall be His Living Body here on earth. On all such there lies a heavy burden of perplexities to be solved and of implications to be explored, for which few will feel themselves equal; but it may also prove that obedience

to the simple conviction that war is a sin in which they dare not take any voluntary share will lead to further light and point the next step which humanity must take to come nearer to God."

Dr. Orchard's concern is not merely with problems connected with war. If any war had never occurred one feels he might have written some such book, though, of course, the war has profoundly colored the picture and sharpened its lines. He deals with problems raised by denominationalism, by "the tyranny of the sermon" and the difficulty of finding in any one man, teacher, prophet, pastor and priest. On this subject of the organization of the Christian Church he has some radical ideas which deserve consideration.

Dr. Orchard recognizes that the supreme failure of Christianity has been in its dealing with the social structure of our life and the absolute conflict between the ideals of Jesus and our economic order. To the present reviewer perhaps the most original and suggestive but least conclusive chapter in the entire book is that entitled "The Application of Christianity." Dr. Orchard thus sums up his own conviction:

"The construction of a true order of society, therefore, seems to be the church's immediate duty, not to be deputed to any other power, not to be postponed until some general revolution in the social order has taken place, nor to be attempted on the usual political or coercive lines. It is here that the church's salvation may be found."

In suggesting how the church is thus to construct a new social order he is necessarily and admittedly vague; apparently he looks for the upbuilding of a communistic system within the church. He suggests:

"May it not be possible that a family monasticism of the type that apparently prevailed in early Celtic Christianity offers a line that has not yet been worked out?"

That a writer so keen and incisive should confess his lack of ability to deal more adequately with this, which is the most fundamental of all problems, is new proof of the extraordinary necessity laid upon Christians to undertake a united search for ways of working out the principles of Jesus in the organization of our life together. Toward such a search, the author gives us in this book the inspiration of a soul inspired by the passion of Christ and a mind unafraid to cut through the thick tangle of insincerity, superficiality and sentimentality, which have so long blocked the road of progress for the Christian church.

"UNDER FIRE," BY HENRI BARBUSE (E. P. Dutton & Co., \$1.50)

This is by all odds the greatest book thus far produced by the war, and thoughtful reviews have so strikingly praised it as to leave nothing new to be said. In this story of a French Squad we instinctively feel that here we have the truth about war—the truth that may yet free men of its terrible curse. By the side of its fearful realities the comfort Donald Hankey brought to our souls seems like fine dust in the balance. The author accepts this struggle as necessary and the book leaves one not without hope in the capacity of common men caught in this hell of sordidness and cruelty to toil unselfishly for a better day.

It ought to be made required reading for our theologians with their easy reconciliations of war and Christianity—and indeed for all thoughtful Christians.

"KING COAL," BY UPTON SINCLAIR (Macmillan, \$1.50 net.)

Some of us who years ago were stung into sensibility by "The Jungle" have wondered whether Upton Sinclair would ever again find the power to sound for us the depths of industrial tragedy. In "King Coal" is the message once more, yet given in a mellow, kindlier tone. We find here that the "muck-raking" fever of ten years ago has passed into something more positive and permanent, the spirit of brotherhood and revolution. The plot is but slight, the old story of the rich youth in disguise among the workers; and the sex interest has been deliberately softened into friendship. Yet the book is a real novel, dramatic and thrilling, less on account of the personal adventures of the hero than because of the onward rush of inevitable events toward the destiny of labor.

There is startling depiction of the crimes of the coal camps—the brutality of bosses, the forcing of elections, the illegal survival of script payment and company stores, the systematic cheating of miners, and the deliberate sacrificing of lives to dollars by neglect of safety appliances. For these details we are referred not to the personal word of Mr. Sinclair but to government reports published in 1914; and we realize with shame that the investigations which should have brought hope and succor to the oppressed of our own land have been left to moulder on library shelves while America has occupied herself with the sins of Europe.

We who are trying to take our place among the workers as comrades rather than almoners will follow with interest the experience of Hal Warner, who, entering the coal camp as a mere onlooker, soon found himself in spite of the accident of birth one with his fellow-miners in their hopes, their fears, and their life-and-death struggle with the General Fuel Company. To understand is to love, and through "King Coal" there may come to us a better understanding of our inarticulate brothers. Why is the worker so often irreligious, intemperate, shiftless and violent? Why is the labor union necessary? there may come to us a better understanding of our inarticulate Why are strikes organized by outside agitators? An answer to these questions runs through the story of the North Valley camp.

In one significant respect the plot of "King Coal" differs from the usual tale of wealth in disguise. The conventional narrative ends in a shower of benefactions and the redressing of wrongs through the spirit of love awakened in the heart of the hero. "King Coal" ends in defeat, though a defeat not without hope. The knight errant, equipped though he may be with wealth, education and influence, can yet gain at best a transitory skirmish in the long battle against oppression. It is the workers themselves, helped and inspired by those who have left their own places of privilege to fight on foot in the ranks, who must win step by step the economic basis for the kingdom of heaven.

The New World

The New World is published by The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued, not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

Contributions to The New World should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope if reply is desired.

The New World is published on the first of the month. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all advertisements should be sent to The New World, at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York City.

Postscript

The New Peace Proposals

WE feel it incumbent upon us to draw our readers' attention to the situation which has been created by the Central Powers' peace proposals announced as we are going to press. Obviously the proposals as they stand are unsatisfactory. They omit much that may be regarded as essential to a stable peace; and their treatment of certain points is entirely inadequate. But we must bear in mind that these proposals are intended not as a final statement of peace terms, but as a basis for discussion. Whatever their defects, they represent a striking advance upon all previous approaches to peace by the Central Powers, and it is significant that some of the most extreme pro-war London newspapers are insisting upon the need of their serious consideration. It is certain that none of the Allied nations can, without incurring grave responsibility, decline to seize whatever possibilities there may be in this situation for taking the first step toward the attainment of that new internationalism which is to rest not upon the force of arms, but upon the reconciliation of peoples.

What Every American Should Know—The Facts

The facts about the war aims and peace terms
of the warring nations are to be found in

APPROACHES TO THE GREAT SETTLEMENT

By Professor EMILY G. BALCH
With an introduction by NORMAN ANGELL

A concise account of official and non-official discussions relating to the settlement of the war beginning with President Wilson's Peace Note of December 12, 1916; with a valuable bibliography.

A well-known historian and publicist, who has seen the proof sheets, writes:

"This is a book of permanent historical value. The account it gives of diplomatic and political developments throughout the world during the past year is notably full and trustworthy. Professor Balch has given us here, for the first time within the covers of a single volume, a clear statement of the position of the belligerent and neutral governments in regard to war aims and peace terms. For many reasons this will be a useful and even necessary reference book during the coming year."

Price \$1.50 net; at all book stores

Published by B. W. HUEBSCH, 225 Fifth ave., New York City

THIS MARK ON GOOD BOOKS



YOUR PART IN POVERTY

By
GEORGE LANSBURY

In reviewing this book in THE PUBLIC, Alexander Mackendrick says:

"It is written by one who both knows and cares how the poor live, and should be read by every American citizen of whatever political opinion; whether engaged or not engaged in reform or uplift agencies; whether concerned or unconcerned in the social problem."

\$1 net; at all bookstores

Published by

B. W. HUEBSCH, 225 Fifth avenue, New York

The Nation Needs You; You Need "The Nation"

The United States is enlisted in the great war of democracy against autocracy, because the people, following the cultured and thinking leaders of the country, have thought the thing through.

It is to such cultured and thinking leaders of our citizenship that "THE NATION" appeals. This weekly journal of scholarship and the open mind reflects accurately the genius of our American institutions. During the great struggle for humanity and democracy, the views and reviews of "THE NATION" will be read by an increasing number of thinkers and executives who are making America and charting its course in world affairs in these great times.

The weekly table of contents of "THE NATION" consists of timely articles upon national and international affairs—politics, science, industry, sociology, economics, finance, literature, art. Purity of diction and clearness of type make easy the assimilation of this magazine's message.

Try an experimental subscription. Clip the coupon

The Nation
20 Vesey St., New York

\$1.00
enclosed.
Send THE
NATION for
four months'
subscription to

Address, THE NATION,
20 Vesey St., New York City

"THE CHARACTERISTIC DEMAND OF CHRISTIANITY IS FOR A NEW WORLD."—G. K. Chesterton

The New World

A Monthly Journal of Christian Thought and Practice

Vol. I. No. 3.

MARCH 1918

10 Cents

The Nemesis of Secret Diplomacy

Experiences with the I. W. W.

Sydney Strong

Ruthlessness Abroad—and At Home

Henry J. Cadbury

Christianity and the State

Richard Roberts

Signs of the Times

Peace by Discussion—Understanding the British Situation—News from Russia—Has Idealism Failed?—The Hennig Case—Liberty on Trial in America—Radicals in Convention—The Children of the World's Richest City.

U
HXI
.W89

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, New York

JOHN BROWN: A BIOGRAPHY FIFTY YEARS AFTER

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Thomas Wentworth Higginson said:

"It may be safely said that there now remain very few of the personal friends of John Brown, of Osawatomie, who will not be surprised and deeply impressed by Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard's large and mature memoir of him. It is, as the author calls it, 'A Biography Fifty Years After,' and I can only say after reading from first to last, its more than 700 pages, that I have never encountered anything this side of Gibbon's 'Rome' which has made me feel more the personal power of a single work."

John T. Morse, Editor of American Statesmen Series, declared:

"The story has the movement of a Greek tragedy, with its simple beginning then its creation of the sense of personal nearness, then its vague foreboding of terrible disaster, and finally its grand and fatal close. Perhaps in thus dramatically fashioning his volume Mr. Villard obeyed an instinct rather than acted upon a preconceived plan; that is often the case with great work, where a writer's feelings are deeply enlisted. Be this as it may, the merit and charm are none the less; he has seized well a splendid opportunity and has written one of the great biographies of our literature."

*Fully illustrated with portraits, and
other illustrations.*

With copious notes and bibliography. \$5.00 net
postage 26 cents

Boston

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY New York

The Secret Treaties Are Revealed

When the Bolsheviki seized the reins of Government, the Russian archives, with closely-guarded pacts of world significance, fell into their hands. Leon Trotzky, aiming a blow at all secret diplomacy, gave them to the world. He revealed

The treaty by which Italy entered the war.

Agreement with regard to the division of Turkey.

Official telegrams relating to French annexation plans in western Germany and Russian annexation of Constantinople and the Straits.

Telegrams showing that an international group of bankers from the Allied and Central Powers held a conference at Berne in September, 1917, in an effort to end the war.

And other important papers.

**Have you read these sensational disclosures?
Can you discuss them intelligently?**

Every thinking American who, like President Wilson, champions "open covenants," should know their contents.

*The New York Evening Post, 20 Vesey Street, has
published them in pamphlet form. They will be
sent, post-paid, for 10c. a copy. Order yours now*

The New York Evening Post

More than a newspaper—a national institution

**The Fellowship Press
announces the publication of**

"What is Jesus' Way?"

A letter from one minister to another.

"The New Orthodoxy"

*containing Bishop Paul Jones' statement before the
House of Bishops, and also the report of the find-
ings of the Commission appointed to investigate the
charges brought against Bishop Jones.*

**These two pamphlets have a special value at
this time as bearing not only upon the ques-
tion of War and Christianity, but upon the
other vital question of liberty of conscience
in the Christian Ministry.**

Five Cents each (postage paid)

THE FELLOWSHIP PRESS, Inc.

118 East 28th Street
New York City

The New World

Vol. I. No. 3.

MARCH, 1918

10 Cents

The Nemesis of Secret Diplomacy

"There is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known."

THE New York *Evening Post* has done the cause of justice and permanent peace a service of incalculable value by its publication of exact English renderings of the secret international agreements between the allied governments of Europe.* The proposed territorial rearrangements which these agreements defined have, thanks to President Wilson, the Russian revolutionary government and the British Labor Party, ceased to have anything but an antiquarian interest, but the documents themselves afford an invaluable disclosure of the psychology of the imperialistic mind and of the extraordinary cupidity of those financial and commercial interests which have in modern times increasingly subdued the affairs—both domestic and foreign—of the nations to their own purposes.

America and the World

It is necessary that Americans should examine these papers carefully. They must realize in the face of what persistent and profound influences of imperialism the President will have to insist upon his conditions of democratic peace. It is needless to say that the German archives would—could we reach them—reveal to us plans of plunder and exploitation probably more extensive and audacious than those conceived by the foreign offices of the Allies. The German "map of Europe," published some time ago, showed that the dreams of her Reventlows and Tirpitzes were altogether true to type. What the President and American policy are up against is an inveterate tradition; this is a tradition which must be broken finally and completely if the world is to be made "safe for democracy" and if we are to have anything approaching a stable peace. To reach this end the moral passion of the whole American nation must be mobilized behind the President's policy.

*The full text (in English) of these Secret Treaties as revealed at Petrograd may now be obtained, price 10 cents a copy, (postage free) from the office of the New York *Evening Post*, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

The day is past when it was possible to say that America had no concern with the internal affairs of Europe. The world has shrunk into a neighborhood; and America has been dragged into the war because these very internal affairs of Europe touched her own life deeply and vitally. And it is not the internal affairs of Europe alone that are in question. These agreements reach out over Africa and Asia; and it is largely left to America to say whether the weak and backward peoples of these continents are to be handed over to the exploitation of European finance or whether they are to be educated and trained into self-government and ultimate national independence. What we are confronted with is the necessity of establishing a new principle of world politics; and this, let us repeat, is peculiarly the task of America at the present time. If through ignorance or indifference we let slip by us this unique opportunity of moralizing the intercourse of nations, we shall incur the very gravest kind of responsibility.

The Psychology of Imperialism

It would take more space than we have at our disposal to examine in detail the specific provisions of these agreements. Fortunately, indeed, it is no longer necessary to do so. The political value of these precious documents at the moment is hardly as much as the paper they were written on. The Bolsheviki repudiation of the Russian claims and the President's rejection of all plans of territorial aggrandizement have knocked down beyond repair the foundations of this vast and widespread programme of imperialism. But it is as well that we should understand the spirit which lies behind them. For the spirit has not been destroyed with the projects. That remains; and it too must go the way of its fantastic dreams.

A few typical points in these agreements will

show us just what this spirit is and how far it is removed from the idealism with which the common folk of the nations entered upon the war. In one of these papers the Russian Foreign Minister is represented as saying to the French Government that the publication of the treaties made by the Allies during the war, especially those with Roumania and Italy, was regarded by the other members of the Alliance as *undesirable*. Naturally. The common people of Great Britain who sent their sons to die for the sake of Belgium could not be counted upon to stand for the plunder which was the price of Italy's entrance into the war, and so they must be kept in ignorance of that unholy pact. This secrecy is of the essence of the whole business.

The Rights of Small Nations

We have heard a great deal from the beginning of the war about the rights of small nations; and, once more, thanks to the powerful intervention of President Wilson, the Russian revolutionaries and British Labor, this principle has been established as fundamental for the peace negotiations. It is interesting to observe how the principle fares in these secret negotiations. Take two cases, both from the Italian agreement:

(1) In 1912, at the close of the Balkan War, Sir Edward Grey contended for the national rights of Albania. But this is what was to happen according to the agreement with the Italian Government of April 26, 1916: "On receiving Trentino and Istria, Dalmatia and the Adriatic Islands and the Bay of Valona, Italy is obligated, in the event of the formation in Albania of a small autonomous neutralized State, not to oppose the possible desire of France, Great Britain and Russia to redistribute among Montenegro, Serbia and Greece, parts of the northern and southern districts of Albania, and to leave certain territory sufficiently extensive for Albania",—but reserving for herself the right to conduct the foreign relations of Albania. In the very act of reclaiming *Italia irredenta*, Italy was bent on creating an *Albania irredenta*.

(2) The thirteenth article of the Italian agreement provides that

"in the event of the expansion of French and English colonial domains in Africa at the expense of Germany, France and Great Britain recognize in principle the Italian right to demand for herself certain compensations in the sense of expansions of her lands in Erythria, Somaliland and Libya."

Expansion in Somaliland is only possible at the

expense of *the one remaining native independent state in East Africa*, namely Abyssinia. Evidently Abyssinia is not included in the Allied solicitude for small nations. And to both these projects, Italy's allies stood by, consenting.

That the talk of the restoration of Poland was chiefly *camouflage* (blessed word!) is fairly clear. "It is important," said the Tsar's government,

"to insist on the exclusion of the Polish question as a subject matter for international discussion, and on the elimination of all attempts to place the future of Poland under the guarantee and control of the Powers."

The Armenian nation is disposed of by the appropriation of the greater part of its homeland by Russia, and of "Lesser Armenia,"—a considerable tract impinging on the northeast corner of the Levant, by France. In Persia, Russia and Great Britain have already had since 1907 "spheres of influence"—leaving a considerable neutral zone to the "self-determination" of the Persians. But by these agreements that neutral zone was to be added to Great Britain's sphere. In this particular arrangement there is an interesting proviso insisted on by Russia, namely, that as one end of this neutral zone touches the Russian frontier, it would be necessary to allocate that portion of it to Russia. Apparently it would not do for British influence to come too near the Russian frontiers,—so wholly and implicitly did these allies trust one another. Now that the Bolsheviki have abandoned the Russian sphere of influence in Persia, it will be interesting to see whether the British government will make a similar renunciation.* We trust that the British Labor Party will see that this is done and an end put definitely to what was from the beginning a wholly evil and unjustifiable proceeding.

Territory and Commerce

The question of territorial adjustments is closely related to the problem of permanent peace. It is not open to argument that the German annexation of Alsace Lorraine in 1871 formed one of the fountainheads of the trouble which culminated in this war. It may not be amiss to recall a contemporary English judgment upon that transaction. Charles Kingsley, writing to Professor Max Muller, said in 1870,—“My only fear is lest the Germans should think of Paris, which cannot concern them, and turn their eyes away from that which does concern them, the retaking of Elsass (which is their own)

*Since these notes were written, it appears that Great Britain has followed the Bolsheviki lead in abandoning its Persian project or at least, to use Lord Curzon's phrase, holding it "in suspense."

and leaving the Frenchmen no foot of the Rhine-bank." Well, that happened; and we know the result. In another letter written at the same time Kingsley says: "As for the present war, it was inevitable soon or late. The French longed for it. They wanted to revenge 1813-1815, ignoring the fact that Germany was then avenging—and very gently—1807." But if Germany wanted to avenge 1807, how much more might she not want to avenge 1917, if the programme of the French chauvinists had been carried out? For that included (1) the restoration of Alsace Lorraine within the frontiers of 1870, (2) the annexation of the Saar valley basin, and (3) the disannexation of the German territory west of the Rhine. This latter territory is in length about 200 miles, in breadth at the southern end 80 miles, tapering off toward the north to a narrow strip between Holland and the Rhine. It is industrial and populous in the north and it includes characteristically German cities like Coblenz, Aix, Cologne, Bonn and Krefeld. Its population is about seven millions; and this was to be separated from Germany and liberated from all political and economic dependence on her. The territory was to form an "autonomous neutral state" and was "to be occupied by French forces" until the terms of the peace treaty are fulfilled.

It is perfectly plain that the motive behind this scheme was commercial and economic. The new "autonomous" territory being "liberated" from economic dependence from Germany was to become a French commercial preserve. The annexation of the Saar Valley basin is meant to add the rich coal deposits of that region to French economic resources. And the trail of the economic devil is perceptible not only in this agreement, but right through all those that have been made public. For instance:

"The question of forcing Germans out of the Chinese market is of great importance, but as its solution is impossible without the co-operation of Japan, it is preferable to submit it for discussion at an economic conference at which Japan will be represented."

"The recognition of English and French 'rights' in Asiatic Turkey." . . .

"The inclusion within the English sphere of influence of the Persian neutral zone. . . . Of material importance to the Imperial (Russian) government is the question of the building of railroads in the neutral zone, which question calls for further friendly elucidation. In the future, the Imperial government expects recognition in it of full freedom of action in the sphere of influence allotted to it, with the reservation for it specially of prior right of development within such sphere for financial and economic enterprises."

Finance and Peace

In this connection, the financiers' meeting in Switzerland should be noticed. In the British House of Commons, a question was recently asked whether a British banker had met bankers of enemy countries in conference, and if so, what was his name. No answer was given; but this conference appears to have been held; and there is hardly any question that it was attended by German and French bankers. It is also maintained that Mr. Bell, a director of Lloyd's Bank of London, was in Switzerland at the time, though on another pretext.

The account given of the proceedings of this conference must of course be accepted with reserve; but more significant than the proceedings was the meeting itself. It looks as though the world had been on the brink of the most tragical of all possible ends to the war,—a financiers' peace. If the account of the tendencies revealed in the discussion recorded in the dispatches dated 17 October, 1917, is even, moderately accurate, it shows how completely the commercial and financial adventurer has come to control national policies. They talked of the German view of what should be done with Russia from the standpoint of German commercial expansion, and the bearing of this upon English interests, and so forth; and the Russian *Chargé d'Affaires* at Berne said that it could certainly be assumed that some agreement concerning the partition of Russia had been concluded between "the English, French and German branches of the international financial clique." Apparently one argument for the partition of Russia was that Russian unity would prove chiefly advantageous to the United States of America (which was not represented at the conference). With whatever reserve this report must be accepted, it bears a curious family likeness to transactions of the same order in other spheres. Finance has no country; and it may be taken for granted that upon this whole question of the financial interests connected with the war, a good deal of yet unrevealed secret matter has still to be introduced to the daylight.

Whatever share commercial motives may have had in disposing Germany's mind to war (and it is our belief that the economic interest was fundamental in the Pan-German scheme), it is true that they played no part in the first intention of England and France. But it seems clear that the jingoes and the chauvinists among the governing classes of both countries saw in the war an oppor-

tunity of pushing their characteristic program of plunder and economic expansion. Of this perversion of the original disinterestedness of the British and French war aims, these agreements are the product, and the proceedings of the Paris economic conference stand out in a new and searching light in the face of these revelations. One is moved to wonder whether the people responsible for these wild and iniquitous schemes possess a moral sense at all, or whether at least it is not of an entirely different sort from that of common folk. The cynicism which would exploit to these sordid ends the idealism of the British youth that gave itself so freely for the sake of Belgium is nothing short of criminal, and it is clear, surely, that while it prevails there is no hope of abiding peace. If these agreements had been possible of realization, they would have sown the seeds of a future war wider and more disastrous than the present one. Happily they no longer have the power to do so.

An International Magna Charta

Mr. Austen Harrison in *The English Review* is advocating with characteristic ability a scheme which he calls "An International Magna Charta." The gist of this project is that the nations now in conflict should establish the peace of the world on

a foundation of mutual sacrifice. Truly there is no other way; and we believe that the people are prepared for that great adventure. We know that no society can hold together for a day except on a basis of common renunciation; and that rule applies to the society of nations. But while the nations permit their policies to be defined in secret by bourgeois oligarchies who have no thought in their heads but that of national self-aggrandizement, we shall not escape from this vicious chain of aggression and revenge which binds the whole world in bonds so intolerable. But we believe that the day of predatory nationalism is at an end. It has at last worked out its inherent logic on so vast and so costly a scale that it is revealed to the common peoples as the monstrous evil it is; and lest there should be any mistake about it, these secret agreements have shown the source and nature of the trouble in a fashion that is not to be mistaken. We are confident that the people will make short work of it and the supreme opportunity of America at this time is that it may do the immeasurable service of helping the European democracies,—not only German, but British, French, Russian, Italian—to rid themselves of this ancient curse.

Signs of the Times—An Editorial Survey

Peace by Discussion

To a war-weary world peace does not seem near this Washington's Birthday. The German Junkers never appeared more cynical or more dominant. They have, for the present at least, defeated the promised electoral reforms in Prussia, and have crushed down the strikes. They are marching ruthlessly on in Russia. Yet never must it be forgotten that, in the midst of war, peace discussion has been started, and that it cannot be suppressed even in Germany. To that discussion the President made perhaps his most notable contribution in his address of February 11th. Here was new proof of faith in open and public discussion which appeals to the public opinion of the world as the highest authority. If we are ever to have a just and democratic peace it is by this method only that we can attain it, a fact which all the warring governments are gradually being forced to recognize.

Some of our hyper-patriots who only a short time since summed up the whole duty of man in the phrase, "stand behind the President," are much perturbed by what the *New York Tribune* calls "the danger of Mr. Wilson's peace offensive." Even on their own narrow premises we believe they are wrong. Mr. Wilson's policy will tend to hold radical

opinion in the Entente countries behind a war for ends which he has so clearly defined as democratic and not imperialistic, and it will equally tend to stir up the revolutionary forces of Germany and Austria. The no-discussion, fight-to-a-finish policy of the Allied War Council of Versailles, and of our own reactionaries, cannot but have precisely the opposite effect. We should like to know whether our military representative, General Bliss, in any way shares responsibility for this pronouncement from Versailles; it seems hardly possible that he does, so contrary is it to President Wilson's own statement.

Understanding the British Situation

It is disappointing that Mr. Lloyd George appears to have chosen to support Versailles rather than Washington. We doubt, however, if he speaks for his country. His recent victories in the House of Commons are of the Pyrrhic order. His big majorities are due simply to the fact that more than half the members have abstained from voting. Liberal and labor members do not want to force the Premier to appeal to the country in a general election until the new register of voters is completed. An election now would be held on the old register with women debarred and thousands upon thousands of workingmen disfranchised by absence from home in the

army or at munition works. This fact must be remembered in appraising comparative tory and liberal strength in Britain.

The News From Russia

Only the future can interpret the conflicting and disquieting reports that are now reaching us from Russia. As we write (February 22nd) not even the utter surrender of the Bolshevik leaders and their signing of the German terms seem to have arrested the onward march of the German armies. A few days ago it seemed as if the world was to see a new thing. The Russians refused to sign the treaty, which would have given moral approval to a peace which, to quote Trotzky's own words, "would bring with it sadness, oppression and suffering to millions of workmen and peasants." Yet at the same time they declared they would not and must not continue to be at war with the Germans and Austrians—workmen and peasants like themselves. Instead they appealed to the people of the Central Powers. Had this campaign succeeded the era of nationalistic wars would have ended. For a time success did not seem impossible. It was known that the German war lords feared the Bolshevik propaganda; it was by no means improbable that the German Junkers might find their dreams of conquest blocked by their own soldiers. Instead, the Russians have signed the treaty without stopping the foe; and as their latest move have proclaimed "a war of liberty." "Poor Russia" is held up by all our militarists to teach the folly of idealism, at least as a weapon against Germany. But the end is not yet. We doubt if the final interpretation of the lesson of Russia will be given in the words of Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. Stanwood Menken and others of the National Service Congress.

What is certain is that the German ruling class has stripped off the last rag of hypocrisy wherewith they clothed their naked lust of conquest. Gone is the pious talk of no annexations and no indemnities. Von Kuelmann speaks instead of peace made according "to our interests." This is what we might expect of the Junkers, but what of the German people? What of the Reichstag resolutions of last July? Was the Reichstag majority, too, playing the hypocrite's part?

We confidently believe the German people will awake. Their rulers have shown their hand. They fight not merely to acquire Russian territory but to oppose Russian ideas of freedom. Prince Leopold's statement is very significant:

"Russia is sick and is trying to contaminate all the countries in the world with a moral infection. We must fight against the disorder inoculated by Trotzky and defend outraged liberty. Germany is fortunate in being the incarnation of the sentiments of other order-loving peoples."

What have the workers of Germany to say to their war lords as the defenders of outraged liberty against the social democrats who deposed the Tsar? Will they overthrow Russian freedom and so fasten their own chains more firmly upon themselves?

Has Idealism Failed?

To a Christian, one of the saddest features of the news now coming from Russia is the complacent satisfaction with which some churchmen are receiving it. "We told you," say

they, "that idealism wouldn't work. See now, how foolish were your dreams of the power of pacificism." The short answer is this: The degree in which idealism fails, is the degree in which it has been imperfect and faltering.

The Bolsheviks never claimed to hold the absolute ideals of Christianity or to put their faith in a God of Love. They were willing to use violence and bloodshed in the cause of social revolution. Their faith was in the proletariat of the world, and for that faith they have risked what the Church never risked in behalf of her avowedly higher faith. Should the night of autocracy again close down for a time over much of the world, mankind will never forget the achievements of "the glorious Russian mob," its relative self-restraint, its capacity for forgiveness, its faith in brotherhood. The Bolsheviks, not the Christians, attempted fraternization, and though freedom comes soon or late, at last brotherhood will triumph and men will look to the workmen and peasants of Russia as its prophets and pioneers, the heroes of the new age.

To criticise these men with our imperfect knowledge and at this safe distance may seem unfair, yet there are certain questions which force themselves upon us. Why did not the Bolsheviks persist in the policy outlined by Trotzky, neither signing peace or waging war but continuing their propaganda among their German brethren? Suppose the German army had advanced under those conditions: would not their victories have been rendered barren? Would not the revolt of the Teutonic peoples have been greatly hastened? One can understand the enormous difficulties of holding a nation to such a policy of moral resistance, and still deeply regret that the Russians could not have added this venture to their other services to mankind.

There is perhaps a prior question. Why did not the Bolsheviks try this policy of propaganda instead of war in the Ukraine? They fought the Ukrainians not because they were disloyal to Russian nationalism but because they were disloyal to the ideals of the social revolution. So far they were not inconsistent, but in the fighting were they not slaughtering Ukrainian workmen and peasants—their brothers as truly as the Germans whom they had previously refused to fight? From a practical standpoint the war in the Ukraine gave the German Junkers an excuse to hold the loyalty of the German troops: the Russians were fighting their friends. We fear this had considerable influence in defeating the appeal of Trotzky to the German soldiers.

The events of the next few days may answer many of our questions and alter much of our comment. Possibly the clouds of Austrian and German socialist disapproval of their governments, now scarcely larger than a man's hand, may rapidly fill the skies with the storms of revolt. Of one thing only we are sure;—true peace will come at last only by brotherhood among the peoples. Perhaps mankind in the hardness of its heart requires the blood of more Russian peasants and workmen,—dreamers; but now as always the blood of the martyrs is the seed of God's true Church, of the great new age of justice, brotherhood and peace.

A Notable Case

The ending of the Hennig case gives us cause for real pride in our judicial machinery. Here was the first trial for

treason in the United States since the Civil War. The defendant was as good as hung by the sensational press, yet he was acquitted inside of four minutes, and that at the request of District Attorney France. It is no easy thing for a prosecuting attorney in a treason trial, during time of war, to keep his vision of truth so clear and his courage so high that he could interrupt the case to announce his own conviction of the defendant's innocence. Mr. France deserves well of the republic.

If we link this case with the general approval given throughout the nation to Mr. George Creel's warning against a campaign of hate, we have cause for no small degree of confidence as to the essential sanity of the American mind and temper.

Liberty on Trial in America

Some of the battles of liberty within these next few weeks will be fought not in the trenches of Europe but in the courts of the U. S. A. Three cases may be regarded as typical, though by no means unique:

1. The appeal of the Christian Pacificists in Los Angeles, set for the fifth of March. The issue here is simple: Shall men be imprisoned for "unlawful assemblage" because they were gathered in a religious meeting "to protest against the militaristic interpretation of Christianity." If so, vital religious liberty in America is dead and the human conscience becomes the helpless slave of whatever government may be in power.

2. The case of the editors of *The Masses* to be tried in New York, probably about April first. This involves freedom of speech and the press, and the rightful limits of criticism of the government in war time. Can democracy suppress minority opinion and still be democracy?

3. The I. W. W. cases. In our next number we hope to publish a careful analysis of the issues involved in this notable trial. They involve the whole right of men to organize for a change in the economic and social system.

In all these trials our American ability to do justice is at stake. One of our chief enemies is the disposition of reputable citizens to judge by their prejudices; another is our virtual inability to get the truth through the ordinary newspaper channels. Partly by carelessness, more by deliberation, the truth is suppressed and distorted. In case after case the painful fight of men and women unjustly accused has simply been to let in the light. No one can have been in touch with the struggle for civil liberties these days without a feeling of despair, not as to the fundamental soundness of informed public opinion, but as to the channels of information. Press, platform, and pulpit, with rare exceptions, are controlled consciously or unconsciously, by jingoism, prejudice, complacent ignorance, or by the more sinister influences of "big business."

We urge our readers to keep their eyes on the three typical cases we have named—try to find out from your newspapers what happens in each case—and if you can't find any, or sufficient information write to the editor. Just as it is true we get the kind of government we deserve, so it is true we get the kind of newspapers we deserve.

American Radicals in Convention

The hastily summoned Convention held in New York on February 16th and 17th was successful beyond the hopes of its organizers. Four hundred and fifteen delegates attended, representing 27 states, 31 labor, 34 socialist, 56 radical, 10 liberal bodies and 30 locals of the People's Council. The meetings were marked throughout by remarkable enthusiasm and unity of purpose. The Convention unanimously elected James Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, its delegate primarily to the Inter Allied Labor Conference whose sessions began February 20th, and secondarily to all the European radical movements, with which he could get in touch. What is more, the Convention easily raised sufficient money to pay for Mr. Maurer's expenses and its own charges. It adopted a thoroughgoing radical program for world peace and democracy, and passed resolutions urging the election of peace delegates from all countries by proportional representation.

Singularly instructive and interesting was the debate at the Sunday morning session on the subject of international migration. The tentative program called for complete freedom of movement. This of course ran counter to the regular labor program of protection and there followed a keen discussion between the exponents of international idealism, among them Scott Nearing, and the spokesmen of the old craft-union point of view, full of the sense of the immediate practical difficulties in an immigration from the East not only unrestricted, but incited and exploited by the profit-seeker. James Maurer spoke for restriction but said that if the Conference adopted the other point of view he would loyally represent their position. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of free migration.

The Children of the World's Richest City

Twenty-one per cent. of the school children of Manhattan are undernourished, according to the statement of Dr. Josephine Baker, head of the Child Welfare Commission of the Department of Health.

In no spirit of apology for short-comings in supplying war needs, we may point out that not even the charges of the severest critics approach in seriousness this simple statement of conditions in New York, which are typical of those in all our industrial communities. From the standpoint of national safety, Dr. Baker points out a menace worse than any exposed in the Senate. Yet her statement got a brief, inconspicuous paragraph in the day's news. It wasn't exciting or emotionally appealing! It didn't have the heart interest of a "good" murder—this news of the slow murder by starvation of twenty-one out of every hundred of our children. It was only a story about the poor whom we have always with us. But as long as we have that sort of poverty we shall have no real peace, no democracy worthy of the name. The situation may be improved, as the Lunch Committee urges, by public lunches. It can only be *cured* by striking at the economic roots of poverty. The first step is for American citizens to awaken to the issue.

Ruthlessness Abroad—and At Home

HENRY J. CADBURY

Amos I, II.

PREACHING is so regular a part of modern worship that we are apt to forget that it is a comparative innovation. The earliest religion consisted in prayer and sacrifice and had no place for exhortation. The modern sermon apparently is to be traced back for its origin to the movement called Hebrew prophecy. Out of the obscurity of primitive religion, out of the formalism of ritual worship, there emerged in Israel a series of inspired teachers or preachers, who spoke directly to the men of their day, rebuking them for sin and pointing the way to national reform. They were an early "Mission of National Repentance and Hope." The names of most of them are forgotten and many of their sermons are lost. But in four large volumes their literary remains have been collected and preserved—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve.

I

By general consent the oldest of these so-called "writing prophets" is Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa. He lived in the silver age of Jeroboam's kingdom, under Jeroboam the Second. The land of Palestine—the Belgium of antiquity—though ringed about with enemy nations great and small, was enjoying temporary peace and prosperity prior to the bursting of the great Assyrian storm. The northern kingdom through two centuries of independence had acquired some sense of national pride or at least a strong national antipathy to the inveterate foes that surrounded it. For a hundred years the strong house of Jehu by successful wars and diplomacy had not merely avoided civil war and anarchy, and held its kingdom intact: it had even enlarged its borders, extended its commerce and enriched its nobles and merchants.

To Bethel, the religious center of this kingdom, came the Judean peasant, Amos. His first words were well calculated to win the approval of his hearers. In turn he mentioned the chief foes of Israel, he rehearsed their outrages on justice and international law and promised for them a terrible destruction.

"Thus saith Jehovah: For three transgressions of Damascus, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron. But I will send a fire into the house of Hazael, and it shall de-

vour the palaces of Ben-hadad. And I will break the bar of Damascus, and cut off the inhabitant from the valley of Aven, and him that holdeth the sceptre from the house of Eden; and the people of Syria shall go into captivity unto Kir, saith Jehovah."

One by one with repeated refrain the surrounding nations are condemned. Gaza, the next to be mentioned, represents the old Philistine alliance that had fought so stubbornly with Saul and David for the control of Canaan. "For three transgressions of Gaza, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they carried away captive the whole people, to deliver them up to Edom." And so Amos swings around the circle, mentioning the charge against each offender and threatening a suitable doom. Tyre is guilty because it had "remembered not the covenant of brothers;" Edom "because he did pursue his brother with the sword and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath forever;" the children of Ammon "because they have ripped up the women with child of Gilead, that they may enlarge their border."

Very modern is this series of atrocities which Israel had suffered at the hands of its neighbors—the iron flail of Syrian conquest in Gilead, wholesale deportations of the population by Gaza and Tyre, treating as scraps of paper the treaties of peace, relentless, military ruthlessness, gruesome mutilation of non-combatants for the sake of aggressive imperialism, and the blighting of lives unborn. One can readily picture the sympathy and righteous indignation with which Amos' hearers applauded his pronouncement of the condemnation of God upon the frightfulness of their foes. Even in cases where they were neutrals as between Moab and Edom, the Hebrews would share the prophet's horror for the Moabite violators of natural decency and international law who had "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime."

But suddenly a change comes over the faces of the Bethelite revellers.* Unexpectedly the prophet brings the charge home to Israel itself. With the same hammerlike refrain he begins again—"For three transgressions of Israel and for four I will not turn away the punishment thereof." The con-

*The stanza of judgment on Judah, (Amos II, 4-6,) is omitted as many scholars consider it secondary.

demnation that they had so eagerly welcomed when applied to their enemies is now laid upon themselves. Having burned with righteous indignation at the mote in another's eye they had failed to see the beam in their own eye. They, too, were guilty of frightfulness. That is the prophet's swift and hard blow upon them.

II

There were two specially striking equations in this unexpected arraignment. Such a condemnation of Israel would seem to Amos' hearers not merely unpleasant, it would be both unpatriotic and blasphemous. They believed that they were a people of special privilege and position. They were the chosen of Jehovah and he was on their side. Whatever they did was right, and their foes were the foes of God also. This patriotic assumption Amos boldly challenged. In the sight of Jehovah, he declares, all nations are on the same level. There is no place before him for special pleading. Twice again Amos reverts to this same theme and each time he attacks squarely one of the favorite bases of national assumption. Two events were evidently considered chief proofs of God's special favor for Israel—one in the past, the deliverance from Egypt, the other in the future, the day of Jehovah. No event in their history was so often cited as a sign of God's choice and care of Israel as the Exodus. It is constantly mentioned in the Hebrew scriptures, (e. g., Amos II: 9, 10). Amos does not deny the hand of God in this event, he merely calls attention to parallels in God's favors to their enemies.*

"Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith Jehovah. Have not I brought up Israel out the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir? Behold the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth."

In similar fashion Amos corrects the prevailing view of the final judgment of God. The Hebrews, after the manner of national religionists, had so identified their God with their own interests that they had looked upon his triumph as the day of their own success. They used "the day of Jehovah" much as modern schoolboys use the term "our day" or the modern patriot "*der Tag*." They did not expect God to be an international neutral. Amos plainly warns them of their mistake.†

"Woe unto you that desire the day of Jehovah! Wherefore would ye have the day of Jehovah? It is

darkness, and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him. Shall not the day of Jehovah be darkness, and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it?"

But more novel still was the second equation of Amos' sermon, for it was an equation between two kinds of sin. The same refrain that so boldly condemned Israel to the same punishment as its heathen foes clearly associated with their enemies' crimes, crimes of a different nature. The three or four transgressions of their neighbors had been atrocities in war and ruthless conquest. Israel's past history, too, had been marked by similar acts,* but it is not these that the prophet chooses to classify with the crimes of the Syrians and Philistines. It is sins of the domestic regime, of the industrial and social order at home.

"Thus saith Jehovah: For three transgressions of Israel, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have sold the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes—they that pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor and turn aside the way of the meek; and a man and his father go unto the same maiden to profane my holy name; and they lay themselves down beside every altar upon clothes taken in pledge; and in the house of their God they drink the wine of such as have been fined."

Under the same condemnation as the atrocities of war are the atrocities of peace, in the same category with exploitation of foreign peoples is the exploitation of the lower classes at home. Industrial slavery is on the same level as political slavery and the ruthlessness of the forum and the market place is as unpardonable as that of the battlefield. Repeatedly the prophet returns to this theme—bribery, greed, oppressive luxury, violence, perversion of legal justice, monopoly, false measures, adulterated food, and all the other evils of a corrupt industrial order. Even though these crimes are done in the name of religion and under the shadow of the altar they are none the less crimes. Fair names and ideals, the formal worship of God and scrupulous observance of certain religious rites are no real cloak for injustice and crime.

"I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meat-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."†

*Amos IX: 7, 8.
†Amos, V: 18-20.

*e.g., 2. Sam. XII: 29-31.
†Amos V: 21-24.

III

The effects of this sermon of Amos are not explicitly recorded, but they are not hard to conjecture. The kingdom of Israel, we know, survived for only a few years. Amos himself no doubt met the rebuffs of a true prophet. One illuminating incident is told in VII, 10-13:

"Then Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, sent to Jeroboam, king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel: the land is not able to bear all his words. For thus Amos saith, Jeroboam shall die by the sword, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of his land. Also Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thou away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there: but prophesy not again any more at Bethel, for it is the king's sanctuary, and it is a royal house."

It is significant that the opposition was from the official not of the state, but of orthodox religion. With zeal characteristic of his class he reported Amos to government headquarters as a disturber of the peace, and converted unpopular propaganda into constructive treason. Typical, too, are his words to the prophet himself. He desires to silence his "unpatriotic" moral criticism—or at least to forbid him the publicity of the capital and to censor the sentiments which pilgrims to the shrine would be likely to hear and disseminate. Perhaps like many ecclesiastics since, he felt some responsibility for the sanctuary that it should harbor nothing disloyal. As Amaziah was true to his type, so Amos shows himself the true prophet in his simple, but genuine reply, when, disclaiming any professional authority, he says, "Jehovah took me from following the flock, and Jehovah said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel."

Twenty-five centuries have passed by since the days of Amos, and the scale of things has changed. Our political horizon has widened and its units are no longer petty states of a restricted corner of Asia, but great modern nations and alliances embracing large sectors of the world. The guerilla warfare of the toy kingdoms of Jeroboam and the house of Ben-hadad has given place to the Great War, and the outrages have become organized, multiplied and extended. Air raids and starvation blockades merely enlarge the scope of operations of the iron flails of Syria and the swords of the children of Ammon. Industrial life also has changed its scale and its abuses also have become organized and extended. Exploitation, graft, economic monopolies and in-

justice have become wholesale rather than individual, in corporations as well as in men, and in well-defined classes of society.

But many things have not changed with the years and the earliest recorded sermon of history must be preached again to-day. In international affairs the same lust of conquest, the same relentless vengeance to the bitter end, the same cold cruelty in the name of military necessity and national interest continue, and in social life—greed, oppression, luxury and indifference to the interests of the poor. Nations still gladly condemn in other nations what they condone in their own history or in their allies. They forget the two equations of Amos—the equality of moral national responsibility in the sight of God, and the equivalence of economic and industrial injustice to the atrocities of war.

And organized religion is still often merely the ally of the government and of the industrial *status quo*, more concerned to serve Caesar and Mammon than to render "unto God the things that are God's." It still shelters the self-satisfied, comfortable classes "who are at ease in Zion," but "are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph," while it strives to silence moral criticism or to exile into obscurity as traitors the God-sent prophets who compare injustice within a nation to the universally condemned sins of its foes.

To the Youth of the World

But I hope. I hope because of the young. And to them I now turn. To you, young men, it has been given by a tragic fate to see with your eyes and hear with your ears what war really is. Old men made it, but you must wage it,—with what courage, with what generosity, with what sacrifice, I well know. If you return from this ordeal, remember what it has been. Do not listen to the shouts of victory; do not snuff the incense of applause. But keep your inner vision fixed on the facts you have faced. You have seen battleships, bayonets and guns, and you know them for what they are, forms of evil thought. Think other thoughts, love other loves, youth of England and of the world! You have been through hell and purgatory. Climb now the rocky stair that leads to the sacred mount. The guide of tradition leaves you here. Guide now yourselves and us! Believe in the future, for none but you can. Believe in what is called the impossible, for it waits the help of your hands to show itself to be the inevitable. Of it and of all our hopes, the old, the disillusioned, the gross, the practitioners of the world are the foes. Be you the friends! Take up the thought and give it shape in act! You can and you alone. It is for that you have suffered. It is for that you have gained vision—*From "War and the Way Out," by G. Lowes Dickinson.*

Personal Experiences with the I. W. W.

SYDNEY STRONG

HUMANITY, it would seem, must have, like a dog, some bone to gnaw. In the United States the bone at this particular time is the I. W. W.

If a bystander interferes, or calls attention to the fact that the dog is gnawing not a bone, but his own leg, the bystander is lucky if he gets off with a growl.

I know, because I have heard the growl and even felt the bite. A little personal experience will serve to throw light on the temper of the public and on the nature of the I. W. W.—its members and methods.

Last October I gave an address on "Industry and Fraternity" before the National Council of Congregational Churches meeting in Columbus, Ohio.

If I had wished to create a sensation I should naturally have chosen some other place and occasion; for Ohio is my native state. I studied in Oberlin, Wooster and Delaware; I enjoyed pastorates at Mt. Vernon, 30 miles to the north of Columbus, and at Cincinnati, 100 miles to the south. Many old friends were there whom I had not seen for years, friends who had "helped to raise" me. Only the week previous I had given a centenary address at Strongsville, Ohio—a town founded by my grandfather, John Strong. Naturally, I had no desire to shoot off firecrackers.

My address was on Industrial Democracy. I had thought it rather a tame performance and went to bed that night feeling that I had disappointed the "generations looking down" upon me "from the pyramids."

I awoke next morning, in a mild way, infamous. I was being damned in thousands of barber-shops from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Of course, I got a leader in the Seattle papers and the headlines—written for those who run and read—told my neighbors that I had—

"EXTOLLED THE I. W. W.,"

*"LAUDED THE PRACTITIONERS
OF SABOTAGE,"*

*"LIKENED I. W. W. TO EARLY
CHRISTIANS,"*

and had described them as *"Men of Beatific Countenance Who Believe in the Beautiful Theory of Non-Resistance."*

The members of our Seattle Ministers' Federation read about my "seditious speech" on their way to their regular Monday meeting and were on the point of expelling me, when it was suggested that "ministerial courtesy" should grant me a hearing before execution. On my return home the mob-spirit—led in our country by the high priests of public instruction, the newspapers—had considerably cooled down. And I am still a member in the Ministers' Federation, "in good and regular standing."

And here I take the liberty of repeating a portion of my address at Columbus. Its reception by the public will serve as a commentary on the public temper and it will furnish the reader with some of the ideas I entertain about the I. W. W. and how to treat them.

In the course of my address I had asked, "Among the delegates to the National Council how many came from labor, and why? Is there any significance in the fact that the vast majority of the delegates to the council are representatives of the capitalist world?" I then went on to say:

I now venture the suggestion that one practical way for the church to help christianize Industrial Democracy—when it fully comes—and to make it safe for the world, is to become acquainted with labor. I do not see how the church can help to put the industrial order on the road toward justice and universal comfort until the church strikes hands with labor movements—at least tries to understand them.

I proceeded to take up organized labor as represented by the A. F. of L., the Brotherhoods, and the I. W. W., and to speak of the attitude to be assumed by the Church toward these representative organizations.

Take for example the American Federation of Labor, with its two and a half million of members, and the unions like the Railway Brotherhoods. The churches know more about almost any other organization—missionary, educational, charitable, than about these great labor organizations, containing millions of the best citizens in the land, engaged in a struggle toward social justice and universal comfort.

There is next to no joint-effort in enterprises like child labor and minimum wage and referendum and workmen's compensation and playfield measures. Generally the commercial organizations found opposing labor in its struggles for justice and human comfort have many leading members prominent in the church. And let a pastor take an interest in the aims of organized labor and visit labor temples and labor conferences, and especially let him pronounce in favor of the "Union Shop"—which I should think every employer would help to organize

—and he will be sharply criticized by church members.

Industrial Unionism is worthy of the most cordial approval of good citizens. Many of the finest blessings in our social state have been initiated and secured by the Unions. Labor has not only the right to organize but should be heartily encouraged to organize and the church should seek to co-operate with labor whenever opportunity offers.

I shall be pardoned, I hope, if I proceed to give here practically all I said to the Council about the I. W. W.,—on account of which I was nearly eaten by the “beasts at Ephesus.”

Will you bear with me when I speak of the church making an effort to understand such a labor movement as that of the I. W. W.—the Industrial Workers of the World. I know the topic is a hot poker and I am anxious to handle it at the right end. Many men go right up through the roof at the mention of the I. W. W. I hold no brief for the I. W. W., but I inherited from my father a disposition to understand the other fellow before I formed judgment, and not to form judgment without knowledge—and the worse the other fellow was said to be, the more carefully to investigate.

A labor problem like this one cannot be waved aside with a sneer, “O, yes, I. W. W.—I Won’t Work”—for it is not true; since I know that the great grain and apple and lumber output in the West has been accomplished in part by these itinerant workers—who are not hoboes.

A labor problem like that of the I. W. W. cannot be solved by wholesale arrests. You can jail men so fast that after a while it becomes an honor. And besides, jails afford nearly as good accommodations as some of the logging camps. I have visited some of these workers in jail and they have learned what Paul and Silas learned, that it is best to sing—and singing has often opened prison doors. I suspect that wholesale arrests of these itinerant workers will produce the same effect that Pharoah’s treatment of the Hebrews produced—the more he afflicted them “the more they multiplied and the more they spread abroad.”

I am urging that we be fair toward a really profound labor movement of this kind—not to greet it with an autocratic sneer, but with democratic sympathy. For over a year I have tried to get acquainted with these men—because I want to be pro-human. I followed closely the ins and out of the Everett tragedy—when a year ago many men lost their lives—shot—the sequence of a long and bitter capital and labor struggle. I blame no one now—though it might have been avoided by the introduction of good sense and Christianity. I followed, as a spectator, the long trial of 73 men, all I. W. W.’s, for murder—the longest trial in the history of our local courts. The men were acquitted. What impressed me all through the trial was the frankness and sincerity of these walking workers. I have visited the I. W. W. halls—the club houses of itinerant workers. I have had these workers at my table and for an evening conversation, and I agree entirely with the remark of Governor Lister of my state—a remark not prompted by “good politics”—that not one-tenth of the Industrial Workers of the World are bad men. Many of them are idealists with a beatific glow on their faces that a preacher might covet. One of them recited in our parlors poems—his own—that

could not be equaled by a University professor of English.

Let me say again that I hold no brief for these men—my interest is pro-human—they have many faults, and I do not subscribe to much of their teaching, and to many of their actions. It is a revolutionary body; but when I am perfectly fair and true to my own observations I am compelled to say that we should discover the good in their movement that will help on the road toward social justice and universal comfort.

You may not approve, but I am in fairness compelled to add that this movement, like most popular movements, in several particulars, bears close resemblance to early Christianity. The keywords that you find on their speakers’ lips, and in all their literature are—*Solidarity*. The solid unity of interest of the workers of the world. *One Big Union*. Whether it is practical or not—their ideal is that all workers, since they have common interests, should organize for united effort. *Fold Your Arms*. If you do not like conditions, fold your arms. This comes as near to the use of non-resistance as an industrial weapon as anything I can conceive of. *International and Interracial*. The ranks of the I. W. W. are open to every son of man—Mexicans, Chinese—of all colors and from all climates.

They have their martyrs. I found in their halls no busts of Luther, Wesley or John Robinson, or Caesar or Marcus Aurelius; no pictures of the Roman forums, of the Coliseum with the Christians thrown to the lions, no photographs of popular actresses—such as adorn the walls of cultured Christian homes; but I saw the pictures of their comrades who had lost their lives in our mines—of the busts and masks of fellow-workers who had been shot by sheriffs or murdered by assassins.

And these tens of thousands, wisely or unwisely, are seeking an industrial commonwealth in which there shall be no capitalist—for they repeat over and over “there is nothing in common between capital and labor”—meaning, of course—not what their enemies declare, that they desire any harm to any capitalists as persons, but that the wage system must go;—that the conflict between capital and labor is irrepressible—that the capitalist system must disappear.

And I add: whether the capitalist system, with its feudalism, will disappear without violence depends upon whether there are Christian men enough who believe there is a better way than the way of violence.

We churchmen must understand these men and not dismiss them with a sneer. We must open up our homes and talk with them; open our clubs and talk with them, and when they are thrown into jail—often without warrants—we must visit them. Senator Works of California, heard Mr. Thompson, a national organizer, tell the story of the Bisbee deportation and “while he came to mock he stayed to pray.”

I have at least one conviction, that I will not believe anything evil about a man, or nation, or race, for which I have no full evidence for believing.

So, I appeal to church people to believe nothing evil about labor, without adequate and sympathetic understanding—to the end that we may help bring in the kingdom of social justice and universal comfort. A man who believes a lie without adequate investigation, is as bad as a liar, without the liar’s originality—and liars do not dwell in the kingdom of heaven.

And this address nearly cost me my ministerial head—indicating the rather irrational sensitiveness of the public mind on the subject of the I. W. W.; indicating that even the messengers of the Gospel of Peace slip into acts of violence!

In conclusion let me refer for a moment to the question of sabotage. Few charges of sabotage have been proven against the I. W. W. That bitterness occasionally manifests itself would naturally be expected. Yet I have been told by foresters that where the I. W. W. are humanely treated they are among the best of Uncle Sam's fire-fighters. Before anyone should wax hot on the subject of sabotage, he should remind himself, what Dr. Veblen has made clear: that the practice of sabotage enters into the daily life of the modern business world.* Society, with a "plank" in its eye, should not be hypercritical nor hypocritical over a "splinter" in a "brother's eye!"

The vast majority of the I. W. W. join the organization to better their condition—the motive that obtains with all people. Many of them believe, however, that they have hold of ideas that will presently rule the world. They believe that the capitalist system must go, that all power and all products should be in the hands of the workers of the world.

They are enemies to the present capitalistic system of production and distribution. They not only admit it, but glory in it, and believe that justice cannot rule among men until the capitalist is eliminated. Their personal experience with capitalists and with the police and deputies and the "capitalistic courts" has strengthened their belief that the "system is bad" and must be changed, so that the capitalist will be left out.

I feel certain that there is no danger in this labor movement—as there is no danger in any labor

movement—if men are treated fairly—treated merely as human beings. I have failed to discover that the I. W. W. differ from the general run of humanity. I am persuaded that they hold a real case against society as at present organized: that if they are treated as Pharaoh treated the Hebrews, we are in for some Red Sea experiences; that however, if they are humanely treated on the line of the Golden Rule, their complaints honestly considered, their ideas openly discussed, while it may mean a clipping of the wings of the capitalist (if he has wings), if not his elimination—they will be found to have made a real contribution to the welfare and advancement of mankind.

Educating Capital and Labor

Mr. Charles M. Schwab in his remarkable role of prophet of the new order speaking of the coming domination of the world by labor said we must not fight this movement, we must educate it. He was right but the education must extend to all classes. The report of the President's Mediation Board published on February 9th is an excellent beginning for such a course of education. It is encouraging to find such a grasp of industrial problems in the report of any government commission and it is good to get its recommendations before the patient is dead. The Board's explanation of the motives behind the I. W. W. movement and the conditions out of which it grows, is far less romantic than the legend of German gold and presents an even greater challenge to true patriots who wish a just solution of economic problems. The report of the Board is not only valuable for its analysis of conditions but is genuinely constructive in its recommendations as to the abolition of profiteering, the institution of collective bargaining, of the eight hour day, and the establishment of machinery for dealing with grievances. It remains a question whether this report like some others that have preceded it does not imply the necessity of more radical measures than the authors propose, but as it stands it is a piece of work which deserves the highest praise.

A Prayer for Use in Time of War

O Loving God who hast infinite compassion for all the griefs of men, we turn to Thee in this hour of the world's anguish, and with penitence beseech that Thou wouldst lead the nations to a right conclusion of the war. Bless our own country and the peoples with whom we are allied; our enemies and all neutral nations; perfect what is good in the aims of each, bring to naught what is evil. Be with all soldiers and sailors; reveal to them the purity, the power, and the love of Christ. Comfort the homes from which they have gone forth. Help us all to know that Thou canst yet bring blessing from this war; and strengthen us to do Thy will, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

*"Any businesslike management of industry is carried on for gain, which is to be got only on condition of meeting the terms of the market. The price-system under which industrial business is carried on will not tolerate production in excess of the market demand, or without due regard to the expenses of production as determined by the market on the side of the supplies required. Hence any business concern must adjust its operations, by due acceleration, retardation or stoppage, to the market conditions, with a view to what will yield the largest obtainable net gain. So long as the price system rules, that is to say so long as industry is managed on investment for a profit, there is no escaping this necessity for adjusting the processes of industry to the requirements of a remunerative price; and this adjustment can be taken care of only by well-advised acceleration or curtailment of the process of industry; which answers to the definition of sabotage. Wise business management and more particularly what is spoken of as safe and sane business management, therefore, reduces itself in the main to a sagacious use of sabotage; that is to say a sagacious limitation of productive processes to something less than the productive capacity of the means in hand."—page 325 "The Nature of Peace" by Professor Thorstein Veblen (Macmillan 1917).

The State and Christianity

RICHARD ROBERTS

RECENT events in America and in Europe have raised a question in many minds concerning the mutual relations of Christianity and the State. We have been told on the one hand (with proof-texts cited) that we are to accept the voice of the State as the voice of God, while on the other hand it is affirmed (with proof-texts again cited) that while it is true that normally the voice of the State carries with it an authority not lightly to be disregarded, there is no inherent quality in it which guarantees that its voice may not sometimes be opposed to the will of God. Those who hold the former view are apt, especially in the distorting haze of war time, to regard the upholders of the latter as dangerous individualists whose doctrine makes for anarchy; those who cleave to the latter view in their turn regard any effort by the State to constrain the individual conscience as a denial of the ultimate moral order and as destructive of the very ground-plan of democracy. Between these two doctrines how are we to choose? Are we to say that the nature of Christian conscience requires that it shall conform on all occasions to the demands of the secular authority or that it has on the contrary a quality of independence and originality which may set it on due occasion in opposition to the secular authority, and that when it does so, it should be obeyed at all costs; and that further the secular authority is out-stepping its own bounds and inflicting upon itself a real injury when it attempts to subdue the Christian conscience to an unwilling obedience?

I

The Scriptural side of the discussion is easily disposed of. In favor of unqualified civil obedience, the passage commonly quoted is Romans, xiii, 1-4. Moffatt translates it as follows:

"Every subject must obey the government authorities, for no authority exists apart from God; the existing authorities have been constituted by God. Hence any one who resists authority is opposing the divine order; and the opposition will bring judgment upon themselves. Magistrates are no terror to an honest man, though they are to a bad man. If you want to avoid being alarmed at the government authorities, lead an honest life and you will be commended for it: the magistrate is God's servant for your benefit."

This is clear enough; and it would be final if it were not that Paul's own conduct suggests that it

is only true within certain limits. When Paul and Silas were put in prison at Philippi, the charge against them was that "these men do exceedingly trouble our city and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans." Obviously the political theory that held the field in Philippi was that Paul and Silas had no right to publish their personal convictions, still less to act upon them, if the authorities considered them to be dangerous to the security and unity of the State. It was immoral to be a Christian in Philippi; it was a crime to be a nonconformist. But it is perfectly clear that to Paul the authority of the State was not so divine as that of his own spiritual judgment; and on more than one occasion he found himself in conflict with the civil magistrate. It is further of very great significance that the State which St. Paul interprets so generously in the days when it still practised some kind of toleration wears a very different aspect before the New Testament closes. The writer of the Apocalypse had seen the Flavian persecution; and what he thinks of it may be gathered from Sir W. M. Ramsay's comment:

"The Dragon of Rev. XII, 1, is the supreme power of evil, acting through the force of the Empire. When he waited to devour the child of the woman, and persecuted the woman, and proceeded to make war on the rest of her seed; and his heads and his horns are the imperial instruments by whom he carries on war and persecution. The Beast of XIII, 1, with his ten-diademed horns and the blasphemous names on its seven heads, is the Imperial government with its diademed emperors and its temples dedicated to human beings blasphemously styled by divine names."*

This sinister apparition is, be it remembered, identical with those "government authorities" to which St. Paul a few years previously had counselled obedience; one wonders what his view of the Empire would have been had he lived to see the Flavian persecution. In any case, it is plain that the New Testament view and Paul's own practice was that Christians should obey the State so far as Christ permitted them,—not (as our modern political theorist would assert) that they should obey Christ as far as the State permitted them. There is really very little comfort

*Ramsay, "The Letters to the Seven Churches," p. 94.

for the believer in State absolutism in the New Testament.

II

Let us, however, concede what validity we can to his argument. The cohesion of the body politic depends upon the submission of the multitude to a common rule; the refusal to assent to this common rule entails anarchy; and in a time of war, jeopardizes the security of the State. The State is, we are told, so real a good in itself that its preservation becomes a matter of sacred obligation to its constituents; and this an obligation which for the time transcends every other. If we grant all the premises, this conclusion is, of course, inviolable. But the difficulty is with the premises, especially with the major premiss concerning the nature of the State.

1. This difficulty is twofold. First, for the Christian there is a single universal moral order. He cannot accept the view that "there ain't no ten commandments" "East of Suez." The conception of the Kingdom of God is an affair of moral universals, and therefore, so far as he sees the Kingdom, of moral absolutes. He must reach and state his moral judgments in terms of the whole world. He is committed to the Kingdom of God, which is a social vision that (according to the New Testament) transcends all the boundary lines of class and race; and he must order his conduct accordingly. But the State is, on the contrary, a partial and a sectional thing; and although it may on occasions speak in the language of moral universals, yet, whenever it is concerned chiefly with its own security and its own welfare, it is speaking in sectional terms which for the Christian can only have a secondary authority. From the nature of the case the security and well-being of a State must be to him, both in thought and practice, subordinate to the furtherance of that universal which he calls the Kingdom of God; and so when the State of which he is a constituent acts in a way which appears to his best judgment to be inconsistent with the interests of the Kingdom of God, he has no alternative and can do no other than resist the State or decline to participate in the enterprise to which he demurs.

2. Second: The nature of State authority is incongruous with the peculiar quality of the Christian morality. State authority as it is commonly exercised must be external, and therefore mechanical and uniform. In its ultimate logic, it will en-

deavor to subdue all its constituents to a single type, a single submission. The sovereign virtue from this standpoint is law-abidingness,—which in a democratic order represents at best but the moral average of the commonwealth. But the Christian morality is expressly defined in the New Testament in terms which repudiate all legalism. It is in no sense conformity with an external standard,—whether codified law or only *sittlichkeit*. On the contrary it is an inner impulse which expresses itself characteristically, but independently and originally all the time. It has a centre but no definable circumstance; it starts from a base, but has no fixed goal; it has a specific direction, but no detailed programme. It is essentially free and independent; and so far from seeking to achieve a certain standard, its only concern is to be true to itself all the way. And there is no fixed point at which a man, having arrived, he is able to say, "I have attained." This impulse is forever trying to outdo its own best, to transcend its own highest achievement.

Grant that this kind of moral impulse is not a common phenomenon; yet it does sometimes appear, even occasionally on a wide scale. The result is that you have a moral pioneer who begins to upset the established order; and you put him in prison like a criminal. State authority has little use for the man who is better than his neighbors; and when his moral impulse is so vigorous that it tends to disturb the existing social order, then of course the man has to be suppressed. "But his soul goes marching on." The truth is that the genuine Christian moral impulse cannot be made to toe a line. It is an original independent creative thing; and if the State cannot be kept whole and safe without suppressing it, well then, so much the worse for the State. And it becomes a question whether that State which can be kept whole and safe only at this tragical cost is worth preserving at all. In point of fact, it cannot be preserved for long anyhow if it does this kind of thing; for it stands or falls with its reverence for the moral sense in man. The State which persecutes conscience is undermining its own foundations, and is committing suicide.

III

What then is the State? The State in its origin is simply the community organized for the purpose of securing order. It is the apotheosis of the policeman. In modern times it has undertaken functions of a more positive kind; but this has been largely

due to the need of society to have itself secured against the exaggerated individualism of the nineteenth century and its disastrous consequences. State socialism has derived its chief impetus from the reaction against the chaos of competitive industrialism; and there is no State in the civilized world which has not to some extent submitted to the pressure of this reaction. It has come to be recognized that certain public utilities and common services are properly the concern of the whole community and therefore their working is rightly vested in the State. Further, the State is the organ by which the nation (or the political unity occupying a definite territory) conducts its intercourse with other nations; and as on the whole the mutual relations of nations have been of a competitive kind, the State has naturally acted in the main as a defensive and therefore a divisive power. It has become the focus of organized national self-regard. The result of these circumstances has been an increasing centralization of power in the State. In the hands of academic political philosophers (like Treitzschke of Germany and Bosanquet of England) who think for the most part in abstractions, the State develops a sacrosanct character before which the individual is enjoined to bow in silent and awful humility; and in France, during the controversy about the disestablishment of the Roman church, there were authoritative declarations concerning the absolute sovereignty of the State which lacked none of the explicitness even if they lacked the religious warmth of English and German deliverances on the same subject.

We shall probably hear a great deal less in future of this sonorous and turgid mystical talk about the State, for (thanks chiefly to the performances of its German hierophants) the State is coming out of this war a very much bedraggled divinity; and more through the work of Martland in England, Duguit in France, and others, the doctrine of state-absolutism is being thoroughly discredited. What we need is to bring a little intellectual and moral realism into our treatment of the State, so that we may neither exaggerate nor minimize its office. Of peculiar sanctity it has as much as any other social organization, say a labor union or a parish council,—namely, just so much sanctity as it derives from the divine provision that made man a social animal, neither more nor less. This, however, is not to say that the State is not necessary or that it does not possess authority. It is necessary because no

society can cohere without some organization; and it possesses the authority willingly conceded to it and vested in it by those who constitute it. This carries with it the consent of the individual to observe its requirements even though he may on occasion disagree in opinion from those who imposed the requirements concerning their wisdom. Without this concession there can of course be no social life; and it is the business of the citizen to make such concessions to the farthest possible limit.

IV

1. But there is a limit. There is a point beyond which the State cannot justly demand concessions either in opinion or in practice. In the sphere of religious worship this matter has been fought to a finish in the Anglo-Celtic countries; and the State has submitted to that limitation of its sovereignty which is commonly called Toleration. Religious societies are permitted without interference to practice their own distinctive rites or absence of rites, so long as these practices do not palpably interfere with public order. This has happened simply because a genuine religious life cannot be coerced into uniformity. But religion is not the only human interest which is incapable of regimentation. Thought, art, conduct, are all living things which are not to be subdued into uniformity. The State, properly speaking, simply because its authority is external and therefore uniform and mechanical, is not competent to order life save only in its external and material aspects. Its function is chiefly economic; and wherever it has taken upon itself to order life outside this region, it has been disastrous both to itself and to what it touched. With that realm of life which may be roughly called "spiritual," it is not competent to deal. Its methods do not apply.

2. Moreover the authority of the State is limited by that supra-national moral order to which reference has already been made. The crime of Germany was that it professed to believe that the State was a law unto itself, that it could do no wrong; and it had just as much right to make this assumption as a labor union might but has the simple sense not to make. The practical result of this doctrine is to shatter the moral universe into as many pieces as there are states, to introduce an ethical pluralism which must lead to desperate and chronic chaos. There is an overlaw to which the State itself must submit; and which for its own good it should respect when it encounters it in the

soul of even the humblest individual. Only let it be remembered that this doctrine of State sovereignty is not peculiar to Germany. There are advocates of State absolutism wherever there is a State.

The trouble with the State has been its failure to acknowledge these limitations. Political thought and practice have been much too apt to move on the assumption that the whole problem can be exhaustively stated in terms of an abstract individual and an abstract State. But there are vast regions of human life where the State has nothing to say and in these regions there are impulses which may at any time break out and interfere with the external conformities which it is the business of the State to care for. But it has never devised any means of dealing with these impulses save that of repressing them. It has treated the moral pioneer as a criminal and sent the saint to the stake. This is not a reason for destroying the State; it is only an argument for another kind of State. And another kind of State is much overdue if it be true as a modern historian has said that the moral progress of mankind has chiefly been made not through States but in spite of them.

But a new conception of the State is coming; and it is coming because the world demands it. Just as the unity of the United States only became possible through the cession of some elements of their sovereignty on the part of the separate states to the central government, so it is being clearly seen that a warless world is contingent upon the abandonment of the claim to absolute sovereignty on the part of the great States of the world. Without this, there can be no League of Nations; and we have made up our minds that the League of Nations must be.

But this claim to sovereignty will presently be abandoned not merely as an expedient to prevent war, but as the result of an enlarged social vision, a social vision whose frontiers are those of the wide earth. This is growing in more than one quarter,—in the new catholicity of the religious outlook in many sections of the church, in the Socialist International, and in the moral idealism which the recoil from the war is quickening in the wholesome youth of all the belligerent lands. There is a vision of the Kingdom of God slowly dawning upon us, and with it a new understanding of the true values of life, a new perception at once of the universal and the particular, which is going to transform our national

policies on every hand. States so far from being as in the past particularist and divisive will learn to conceive of themselves as organs of international co-operation and good will, and their past preoccupation with sovereignty, whether within or without, will be transformed into a passion for common service. Instead of regarding itself as the organization of the community in its own material interests, the State will conceive of itself rather as the will of the community in its ministry to humanity. With such a State, Christianity can have no conceivable quarrel. And if it be argued that this expansion of interest will enfeeble the virtue of patriotism, the answer surely is suggested by Lovelace's lines where the soldier writes to his sweetheart:

"I could not love thee, dear, so much
Loved I not honour more,"

and assuredly no man has ever yet loved his country as he should until he has learned to love humanity, the Kingdom of God, most of all.

Radicalism and Liberty

The *New York Times* (none too accurate a source of information) tells a story of a Bolshevik at the New York Menshevik Convention, who got into a controversy with Ilya Tolstoy as to his father's condemnation of violence. "Well, then, if he were alive now," concluded the Bolshevik, "we'd put him in jail and Christ, too, if he were opposed to us."

Whether this particular story is true or not, there is always a danger that the radical, like the reactionary, will forget liberty. He has a remedy for the world's ills which will save it despite itself. Moreover he has usually been the victim of oppression, no school in which to learn tolerance. On the whole we may excuse the excess of revolution and even marvel that it is not greater. Nevertheless the hope of the world lies in a radicalism which keeps its fire and fervor but never forgets to trust that truth can win its own victories. If radicalism triumphs by putting Tolstoy, "and Christ, too, in jail," its victory will only sow the seeds of new oppressions, new sorrows, new wars.

Tennessee Celebrates Lincoln's Birthday

On February 12th another negro was burned at the stake after a "confession" of murder had been forced from him by means of torture. This did not happen in chaotic Russia or devastated Belgium or Armenia but in one of the States of that free country which is willing to sacrifice thousands of its sons to prevent the atrocities of the "Huns." When shall we learn that justice and humanity begin at home? How long shall we give some German Dr. Hillis a chance to proclaim a holy war to make America safe for law, order, justice, and the protection of a minority race?

By the Way

For sheer breathlessness, I do not think I have for a long time read anything to compare with Mr. J. H. Odell's article which occupies the first place in the February *Atlantic Monthly*. Its vehement and unrelenting rhetoric swept me along in a sort of dazed stupefaction, and I laid it down, fairly gasping. And then I began to ask myself what it was all about? To this day I have no glimmering of a real answer, and all that remains of it now is the impression of a very angry man laying about him lustily with a club evidently wanting to hit somebody very hard but without just exactly knowing why. It is cheap work railing at the parson,—and from Mr. Odell's own standpoint, his attack is peculiarly unjust. He must have been living in a very secluded valley if he does not know that the preachers have been exceedingly busy at the very thing that he blames them for neglecting. But the question still remains whether after all *this* was their job. In any case this purple oration to *vox et pretere*a—next to nothing at all.

* * *

The place which the *Atlantic* gives to this article raises an interesting point in editorial psychology. I know that it is a sort of literary convention to set out by staggering your reader; but I thought that it was strictly confined to the "shocker" and the novelette tradition. What puzzles me is that the *Atlantic* did not start its February number with Dr. L. P. Jack's fine and balanced paper on "Loyalty Once More," with its fragrant reminiscence of Josiah Royce. What the time needs and what we should expect from the *Atlantic* is some aid to composure and collectedness. The tirade business is done voluminously enough by the daily press, and if the war continues we shall be hard put to it to preserve that mental equilibrium which makes for sound judgment. And if the *Atlantic* fails us, where shall we turn?

* * *

I hear that Mr. Harold Begbie, the writer of the famous "Twice Born Men," has a new story ready for publication. Mr. Begbie has had no misgivings about the righteousness of the war, but he has been greatly moved by the conscientious objector episode in England and particularly by the case of Stephen Hobhouse. My informant tells me that Begbie is profoundly impressed and realises that whilst the warriors have been fighting anti-Christ in the national foe, they have unwittingly put the real Christ in prison at home. The same correspondent tells me that the "1920" articles which appeared in the London *Nation* and created so much sensation were written by J. A. Hobson, the well-known writer on politics and economics; and these are to appear shortly in book form. I think Hobson must have been thinking of Stephen Hobhouse in one of these articles, where he describes the Oxford man who has been nicknamed the "Early Christian" at College because of his habit of attending morning chapel. He was on leave from Dartmoor where

the C. O.'s are segregated, and chanced to go into a restaurant where a small group of his old Oxford friends were eating together. "Hello!" cried one of the company who was in a government office, "back to Paganism again. What price Christianity now?" And the answer came, swift and stunning, "Same old price; thirty pieces of silver."

* * *

It is quite as well to keep our eyes on England just now. Here is the New York *Times* on February 10th reproducing the recent pastoral letter of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster in which he says:

"During the war the minds of the people have been profoundly altered. Dull acquiescence in social injustice has given way to active discontent. The very foundations of political and social life, of our economic system, of morals and religion are being sharply scrutinized, and this not only by a few writers and speakers, but by a very large number of people in every class of life, especially among the workers. Our institutions, it is felt, must justify themselves at the bar of reason. They can no longer be taken for granted. The army, for instance, is not only fighting, it is also thinking. The soldiers have learned the characteristic army scorn for the self-seeking politician and empty talker. They have learned the wide difference between the facts as they see them and the daily press reports of them, and they have learned to be suspicious of official utterances and bureaucratic ways.

"The general effect of all this on the young men who are to be leading citizens after the war is little short of revolutionary. A similar change has taken place in the minds of our people at home. The munition workers, hard working but overstrained by long hours and heavy work, alternatively flattered and censured, subjected sometimes to irritating mismanagement and anxious about the future, tend to be resentful and suspicious of the public authorities and the political leaders. They, too, are questioning the whole system of society."

Cardinal Bourne is not the only person who sees this; it is a commonplace of intelligent observation; but coming from this source it has a peculiar interest. The other day I was shown a letter from an important political personage in a high administrative position in England in which he said: "I am perfectly certain that we shall have to plan wisely and well and evoke the best moral and religious sentiments in our interest, if we are to come through the future—which I am as sure as you are, contains an economic and social revolution—without violence and disaster."

* * *

Kentucky and Maryland have voted for the adoption of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, yet these states are centers of the distilling industry. This piece of news may well bring fresh courage to those pessimists who have feared that American public life is entirely controlled by "the interests."

THE TRAMP.

Seeds of War in the Social Order—Part III.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

A SECOND of the seeds of war in the social order is the present distribution and tenure of Private Property.

The whole subject of the ethics of property, like that of the ethics of competition, calls for a thorough re-examination and re-statement. The institution of private property has grown up and rooted itself in civilization without adequate self-vindication.

Very few men ever stop to ask why they own property, whether they have a right to the property they own, and what limitations ought to be placed on their use and disposition of their own property. Property rights are taken for granted and any suggestion of interference with the unrestricted exercise of these supposedly natural rights is resisted and resisted.

The history of the institution of private property recognizes, however, one broad distinction which may be made in considering the subject. History knows what it calls "property for use" and it also knows what it calls "property for power."

If there be any ethical justification for the institution of private property that justification apparently must be confined to the former of these two kinds of property. Human experience does seem to suggest that a certain amount of private property "for use," that is for the expression of a man's own personality, serving as the medium for the spirit is valid. All property in primitive communities is confined within these limits. A man may own what he can himself use and work, but no more.

There comes a point, however, in the accumulation of private property when it passes beyond the limits of "use" and becomes a form of power, power over other men. The owner of great estates, the capitalist, these modern representatives of the institution of private property, do not profess to use all the property they own. Their property is a form of power over other men, and it is understood and exercised as such.

The whole institution of private property as we know it in the modern world has passed far beyond its primitive and permissible limits as something to use in the process of self-realization and self-expression and has become in the main a morally indefensible form of direct control over the lives and destinies of others.

On the theory that private property for use is

ethically valid, we are justified in launching a fair and open attack upon private property as modern society knows it, just because this institution has been so vitiated that at the present time three quarters of the world have not enough property to "use" in self realization and the other quarter of the world has far more than it can use, its surplus resources being a form of power over the rest of the world.

L. T. Hobhouse states the case bluntly and to the point,

"Five out of six of the children now born, are born to no assured place in the industrial system. They have of their own no means of subsistence. . . . Modern economic conditions have virtually abolished property for use and have brought about the accumulation of vast masses of property for power in the hands of a relatively narrow class. The contrast is accentuated by the increasing divorce between power and use. . . . The institution of property has, in its modern form, reached its zenith as a means of giving to the few power over the life of the many, and its nadir as a means of securing to the many the basis of regular industry, purposeful occupation, freedom and self-support."

To attempt to justify the existing capitalistic system by saying that private property is an ethically defensible institution and must not be examined and corrected for fear of undermining the moral sanctities is an assertion that ought to be self-refuting. The only possible ethical justification of private property is in itself the most damaging criticism of the institution as we now know it.

The subterranean connections between capitalism and war are not always apparent. But that they exist no one can deny. "The ugly head of commercialism" is always thrusting itself up through the tangle of international politics. All the finer instincts of heroism and chivalry and self-sacrifice, which war unquestionably calls out, are too often sacrificed on the altars of Mammonism. The need of markets, opportunities for economic and industrial expansion, occasions for preferential or prohibitive tariffs, these are the occasions of most of the world's wars. There is more truth than fiction in that speech of Undershaft, the munitions maker, in Shaw's play, "The government of your country! I am the government of your country: I, and Lazarus. Do you suppose that you and a half dozen amateurs like you, sitting in a row in that foolish gabble shop, can govern Undershaft and Lazarus? No, my friend, you will do what

pays us. You will make war when it suits us, and keep peace when it doesn't."

Granted that in the ultra-radical attacks upon capitalism, the direct influence of money-power upon politics, may be over-stated and over-emphasized, granted that often other influences beside the exercise of money-power go to the making of wars, granted that nine out of ten men who fight the world's wars have nothing immediately at stake in the economic causes or consequences and may be animated by other and quite idealistic motives, granted all these facts, it is still true, that so long as "the Interests" have the ear of government, as they have unquestionably had it in the modern world, and so long as "the Interests" representing only a small fraction of the population actually have power over the lives and destinies of the great bulk of the population, just so long will war as an institution hover in the offing as one of the normal consequences of those mal-adjustments in the body politic and economic by which the few actually have power over the actions of the many.

The Fallacy of Benevolent Paternalism

And a third and closely connected source of war in the present order is the prevalent system of benevolent paternalism. The nineteenth century saw an amazing spread of genuine humanitarianism. Charities and philanthropies without number came into being and spread like wildfire. In the larger cities today the mere catalog of these agencies runs into the hundreds of pages. Every typical modern Christian is engaged in some form of "social service" or "good works."

But there is creeping into the modern mind the disquieting suspicion that philanthropy and social service would heal the hurt of society too easily. Until most recently practically all our philanthropy has confined itself to remedial work. It has not seen the necessity of attempting the more drastic and courageous task of preventive measures, or when it has seen this necessity it has shirked it, as calling for too radical an attack upon the foundations of things-as-they-are.

There really goes with a great deal of modern philanthropy a flavor of medievalism, a vague intimation that if our modern charities are not a candid bid for the heavenly indulgence, they are at least a sop to the uneasy social conscience. Many of the modern bequests to educational and philanthropic institutions, and many of the more recent foundations for charitable purposes seem to have sprung from the same interior discontent which,

in the old days, built the cathedrals and abbeys. Indeed, the most social minded of us are not far from the crowd that bought indulgences of Tetzels. We silence the social conscience from time to time with a propitiatory check to some favorite charity and postpone the more drastic task of attacking these ills at their source.

When hard pressed the member of the more-favored group says that on the whole it is better for the "other half" that their affairs should be benevolently administered from above by their wiser superiors. "If we paid the workmen more wages they would only waste the extra earnings on whiskey and movies." Such is the hackneyed apologia for the present scheme.

Justice—Not Charity

It is sometimes worth while, however, to get the other point of view, the point of view of the man who asks not for the dole of a benevolent paternalism, but the rights of a democrat, the right of the free man to take his life in his own hands and live it for himself. Any one who has had even the most casual contact with the "other-half" in recent years must realize that there is coming over the less favored members of society a radical change of mood and attitude toward our well meant good works wrought from "higher up." Men and women are not only refusing our charity but they are fighting it as being the real source of their continuing slavery. As an English workman says of most modern philanthropists with bitter truth, "They'll give 'ee no end, but the advantage they've got over 'ee to keep 'ee down under, that they never gives away. And so long as our sort takes their charity for to bide quiet, 'twon't never be no better."

That is the rub. We to whom the lines have fallen in easier places have got to face and decide the problem, not whether we are willing to continue and increase our philanthropies, but whether we are willing to deny ourselves the occasion and opportunity for charity by solving these problems at their source. Charity as it is now organized, in its merely remedial aspects, is clearly a temporary necessity, but the whole effort of genuine Christian philanthropy should be not to perpetuate and extend itself, but to render itself more and more unnecessary and superfluous.

There is a real and sombre connection between benevolent paternalism and war. The forms of state paternalism which have been spreading in Europe have been justified by the immediate well-being which they conducted. But when a man sells

out his democratic birthright for the pottage of old age pensions and the like, he apparently has no redress when the paternalistic state calls him to the colors. Having forfeited to the state his own freedom and responsibility as a citizen he has no alibi in war time.

It is the system of state paternalism, which has been spreading so rapidly in modern Europe under the specious guise of a disinterested altruism, which throttled democracy in the time of crisis and choice, and left the plain people helpless in the hands of their "benefactors." The hope of the future lies not in the extension of the paternalistic attitude and method, whether private or public, but in the furtherance of Christian democracy, that is, the right of the individual to be in things industrial, political and moral not a craven and helpless dependent, but a free man.

Such, then, is the situation in which the thoughtful man of today finds himself. He is beginning to realize that war-time and peace-time are not independent eras in human history, but that they are all woven together into a single texture. The Christian's guilt for this whole fabric lies not in his handling a machine gun or releasing a torpedo in some overt act of actual war. His guilt is deeper than that; it lies in his identification with and his consent to these underlying un-Christian facts out of which war must periodically spring as a logical and inevitable harvest from the seed time of peace.

The Summons to Sincerity and Faith

We turn from these facts to the gospels and we search in vain there for concrete and definite rules to meet the present dilemmas. What we have in Jesus' life and teaching is not a code of ethical maxims intended to anticipate the complex moral problems of the twentieth century. We have in Jesus an attitude toward God, toward man, toward history, which is as valid in one century as another and in one situation as in another. These modern dilemmas of ours have made us realize afresh the experimental nature of the religious life. They have helped us to see that it is now, as it always must be, faith, that adventurous quality, that method of the soul, which distinguishes religion from every other human interest. Our religion, having at once nothing and everything to say to the problems of modern business and politics and war, is seen to be not an "Imitation of Christ" but an Experiment in Christ.

Standing on the threshold of this adventure it seems too high an emprise for us, yet it is this alone which makes contemporary Christianity

worth while. At the present moment it does not seem to us that we can ever disentangle ourselves from the meshes of the intricate and compromising facts of our heredity and our environment.

But let us not suppose that this preliminary and fearless facing of the facts, to which we are now called, will be fruitless in itself or unprofitable for the future. We may leave our theme with a heroic and positive word of Tolstoi's, a word spoken out of that deep misery of conscience which is our common lot today, "There is one and only one thing in which you are free and almighty in your life, everything else is beyond your power. This thing is to recognize the truth and to profess it. I do not say that if you are a landowner, you should at once give your land to the poor; if you are a capitalist you should at once give your money, your factory to the laborers; if you are a king, a minister, a judge, or a general, you should at once give up your advantageous position. . . . But you are always able to recognize the truth as a truth and to stop lying. You need but do this and your position will change of its own accord."

North American Students Mobilizing for Christian World Democracy

These words head the official statement of a six months' campaign (January-June) in our colleges. The movement had its origin at the Student Volunteer Conference at East Northfield, January 3-6, where students, professors and leaders of the church "were led to the united conviction that the program of Jesus Christ offers the only real hope in the present world catastrophe and the only solution of all international problems." That was no ordinary missionary gathering. Hardened convention goers felt the thrill of new and deeper currents of Christian life, and saw with clearer vision the revolutionary, creative requirements of the religion of Jesus which is yet to remake the world.

Reports from the colleges already indicate an encouraging response of professors and students. The superficiality of much of the thinking in our colleges, and the rather conventional nature of their religious life is giving way to deeper and more radical inquiry as to the meaning of Christianity and its message to the new age struggling to be born. Men of the ability, grasp of economic and social facts, and passion for brotherhood, of Prof. Harry Ward are giving personal leadership to this work in the colleges; and the literature that is growing up for use in the Bible classes speaks not in old ecclesiastical formulas but in the searching language of Rauschenbusch and the new social leadership of the churches. What that may mean in deepening the missionary movement, in transforming the churches, in raising up new idealistic leadership for a new age of brotherhood we cannot yet tell. It is certain that it is one of the most hopeful movements within the whole range of organized Christianity.

The Open Forum

Christianity or Humanism?

To the Editors of *The New World*:

Mr. Manville's letter in the last issue of the *New World* is a great and just stricture, not upon Christianity, but upon Humanism, which he proposes as a proper title for the new religion necessary to blaze the trail for a bewildered people.

Theology is merely human interpretation of God's everlasting Truth. Many of these tenets of belief Christ Himself would not recognize as His teaching. In religion, as with every department of life, each generation adds its quota of higher knowledge and discards outworn theology, and the time will come when every human belief that is an insult to the Creator will be put aside. "My people are in captivity for lack of knowledge."

On the other hand the wonderful depth and breadth of Christianity is witnessed to by the fact that so many different interpretations may be indulged in, yet with no compromise of fundamentals.

Regarding orthodox Christianity and organized religion, Christ spoke a parable that explains the situation. It is the parable of the Sower and the Seed. He mentioned four results. A part fell on thin soil and could not grow, a part was choked by weeds, a part was eaten by the birds of the air and only a fourth part fell on good soil and brought forth fruit, but in great abundance. Organized religion is carrying about three-fourths its membership in dead weight. This three-fourths is worse for the cause of Christianity than if they were acknowledged heathen, for they are only nominally Christian.

It is impossible to alter personal conviction upon certain matters of belief such as the Virgin Birth, the Divinity of our Lord, etc. The essential thing in life is to do the Will of God. Christ showed us the method. Many do not acknowledge Him nor His method, but nevertheless are doing the Will of God. One of the best Christians the writer knows is an orthodox Jew who scorns Christians. Christ would be the first to forgive neglect of His personal claim to allegiance. He ever pointed to God.

Many a Socialist, to whom the Kingdom of Heaven is interpreted in terms of economic justice, who scorns organized religion, feels that the one hope of the world is to follow out the program of Christ, whom he feels to be "The great Radical and Reformer." One of the most prominent economists in the country, who has lost all faith in organized religion, says he is "hopelessly a Christian" and the Christ way is the only way.

This is the day when all things are being tried and shaken that the things that are of permanent value may remain. Would that Christians would arise to the challenge, acknowledge our transgressions, individually and collectively and so interpret and live our Christianity that men like Mr. Manville would be charmed back to Christianity. The need of such men in our ranks is great.

Baltimore, Maryland.

B. C. T. HOGUE.

To the Editors of *The New World*:

Doubtless the Editors are themselves amply able to cope with the attempt of Mr. Atwood Manville in the February "Open Forum" to make "the Christian Gospel" equivalent to "a system of theology," which begins with "the fall of man," and continues with a list of more or less obsolete dogmas, mostly unknown to Jesus. On the ground that with 99 per cent. of those called Christians "the word 'Christianity' is synonymous with a belief in orthodox theology," Mr. Manville declares that "any attempt on the part of liberals to claim that they represent true Christianity is an unintentional *camouflage*." Since, however, the editors invite replies from their readers, one who, as a liberal, sympathizes with the doctrine that "the clue to our problems is to be found in the Christian Gospel" would like to submit the following:

1. In spite of the bigotry, intolerance, and other vices which tend to beset religious conservatism beyond other types of conservatism in proportion as religious truths are held more precious, Christianity is "the religion of progress." It is so by virtue of the fact that the fundamental "gospel" of Jesus perpetually *does* triumph over the successive little "systems" that have their day and cease to be.

2. One of the best evidences of genuine Christianity is that it is *not* intolerant of criticism such as that of Mr. Manville printed in *The New World*. Had it not been for the indestructible consciousness on the part of the few constructive leaders in successive generations, that the "gospel" of Jesus consists of vital and germinant principles, perpetually reformulated in "systems" which pass with their times, the religion itself would long ago have taken its place in the limbo of creeds outworn.

3. A philosopher of independent mind and some discrimination, the late Josiah Royce, defined Christianity as "The Religion of Loyalty." Its germinant, vital, principle he considered to be that unreserved devotion to the ideal of the Kingdom of God—in Royce's phraseology "the beloved community"—which was the theme of Jesus' preaching, and the goal sought in his martyr death. "The Christian gospel" so understood seems not an unreasonable field in which to look for "the clue to our problems."

4. In addition to the social ideal which the Christian sets before himself in adopting "the Kingdom of God" as his motive of service and sacrifice, he cherishes also the individual religious ideal of personal immortality. This became part of the Christian faith in consequence of the belief of Jesus' followers that the God of Righteousness for whose Kingdom's sake he went to the cross had raised him to His own "right hand." This principle also, however modified in form by the advance of thought, is not likely to become an obsolete element of "the Christian gospel." It has less to do with the problems of political reconstruction after the war than the principle of loyalty to the beloved community; but it has much to do with some immediate and pressing problems of the eternal present.

BENJAMIN W. BACON.

New Haven, Connecticut.

The Library

War and the Christian Conscience

Certain critics have recently been much disturbed about the popularity of Henri Barbusse's "Under Fire" (*"Le Feu"*). Its realism in the opinion of these delicate minded critics, is "not artistic,"—and moreover it encourages the pacifist!—and this in spite of the fact that the book has had an enormous circulation in France and the author has been awarded a prize by the French Academy. Have we not here an illustration of a characteristic peculiarly strong among English speaking peoples? We are incurably romantic; what we must do, must be noble; the end not merely justifies the means, it sanctifies them; we must fight and therefore we will not see what war really is.

Contrast the popular war books of England and America with "Under Fire." They range all the way from Donald Hankey's record of the reaction of a pure and chivalrous soul to the first fine enthusiasm of a war in behalf of the weak, to Coningsby Dawson's self-conscious description of a man who lives and fights as if before a looking glass. Somewhere in between come the stories of brave, good-natured, unreflective fighters like Arthur Empey or Private Peat.

Perhaps this trait of incurable romanticism helps to account for much of our Christian literature in support of war, or at least of this war. The problem is to keep your Christianity and to defeat Germany. You may have to shut your eyes (probably unconsciously) to large areas, now in war, now in the religion of Jesus, but somehow you get the job done. If you are in earnest and eloquent enough you may almost persuade yourself that you have accomplished the impossible task of facing North by South, but you will not thus succeed in piloting your ship to its desired haven. You may have constructed an able, even idealistic argument for this war; you have not reconciled it with Christianity; and your justification at best will conform more closely to the teachings of *The New Republic* than to those of the New Testament.

"The Challenge of the Present Crisis"

The most popular example of this "north by south" literature is Dr. Fosdick's "The Challenge of the Present Crisis." The author's reputation and eloquence, and his skill in voicing a common state of mind, combine to give this book a wide vogue, but it hinders rather than helps clear thinking on the nature and method of war, and its relation to Christianity.

Dr. Fosdick does not keep his eyes shut all the time to the sight of war as it really is. He has his moments of vision when he can see as clearly as Henri Barbusse. Thus he declares:

"From the stand-point of every high ideal, war is unchristian—essentially, hideously unchristian. After a look at Europe, let no man ever again speak of a Christian war!"

And he has paragraphs of such vigorous denunciation as to make one wonder how the vigilant Mr. Burleson could have permitted the book to circulate. But other paragraphs dissi-

pate the wonder. The man who declares war "essentially, hideously unchristian" finds that the only Christian conscientious objector whom he can respect is the Quaker mine-sweeper or ambulance driver, and in a prayer he argues with God that our wonderful patience wouldn't work and we had to fight.

Here is the crux of the whole moral problem. The Christian must use hideously unchristian means because there is no help for it. Where then is God? If in the supreme emergency of life I have to use exactly the method my soul abhors as contrary to every Christian principle, is not my faith a sort of excess baggage which is a nuisance in the crowded battle of life? Indeed, have I faith?

Dr. Fosdick himself in his capacity as author of "The Meaning of Faith" quotes approvingly Hartley Coleridge's lines:

"Think not the faith by which the just shall live
Is a dead creed, a map correct of heaven,
Far less a feeling, fond and fugitive,
A thoughtless gift, withdrawn as soon as given.
It is an affirmation and an act
That bids eternal truth be present fact."

Of such faith, the faith that finds living expression in many of the English prisoners for conscience's sake, this book shows no sign. War is hideously unchristian! I must wage war. This is at bottom the formula of a sceptic, a materialist, or a pessimist.

Nor can this conclusion be resisted by pointing out, as Dr. Fosdick does, that to live in our unchristian social order means inevitable compromise with the Christian ideal. It is true that the necessity of living in society makes me in a measure a partaker of society's sins alike in peace and war. The only complete escape is the coward's way of suicide. But for that very reason I am the more responsible to direct my voluntary acts toward the ideal, I may be the beneficiary of an unjust economic system. Shall I therefore turn deliberate profiteer? Under the conditions of modern war I cannot escape some indirect part in the struggle; shall I therefore take up arms and deliberately do that which is to me the sum of all atrocities? My task is to play my part for the redemption of society in war or peace. I cannot help to stop profiteering by becoming a profiteer. War, even for a just cause, will not cure war. That method has been tried and failed all through the ages. The Christian pacifist believes there is another method of dealing with evil—even the way of Jesus which led to the cross, but not to war. Humbly, with full consciousness of imperfect vision and faltering courage, he seeks to apply that method. He resists wrong by love, by fearless speaking of truth, perhaps by power of economic organization, but not by the lies, bloodshed and degradation of war.

Dr. Fosdick's failure to understand this position accounts for the superficiality of his work. He who sees and denounces the sins of our age in church and state, who deplores the "belittling of religion" and extols the conception of the Kingdom of God, makes the remarkable declaration:

"A noted English pacifist said to the writer that in the present estate of the world he judged that England could have done nothing else in 1914 save to go to war, but that as for himself, he was a conscientious objector and would have no part in it. He acknowledged a so-

cial necessity, in the meeting of which he refused any share. Nothing could be more immoral."

Later on Dr. Fosdick himself refutes this condemnation when he says that "the Christian's citizenship must *always* (italics ours) begin at the other end from Hartford County, he is firstly a citizen of the Kingdom of God on Earth, a patriot for mankind." So difficult is it to face north by south. It evidently does not occur to Dr. Fosdick to ask whether this English pacifist stood out of the war because he was aware of a wider social necessity than that of England, that social necessity so accurately described by the author as the Kingdom of God on Earth. At least, "immoral" is a harsh adjective to use of a man who (in however mistaken a way) is trying to be the kind of man that Dr. Fosdick says every Christian should be.

This inability to understand the position he would refute crops out in his assumption that he is answering the Christian argument against war by saying that force can be used for moral ends. Very true, but what if force is used in ways that are, to recur to Dr. Fosdick's own phrase, "hideously unchristian" as is the case with war? This is the point to answer. So, too, it is astonishingly naive to cite the Luxemborgian acquiescence in the Prussian invasion of 1914 as disproving the Christian belief in the power of the moral resistance of a nation willing to be a martyr; or to refer to the Roman treatment of Jews who would not fight on the Sabbath but who fought like fiends the rest of the week, as proving how powerless Christian "non-resistance" would be to touch the hearts of soldiers.

One who loves the church must lay down this book by one of her most brilliant and enlightened leaders with profound disappointment; yet thoughtful Christian pacifists owe Dr. Fosdick a certain debt for forging in his discussion of war, of the social order and notably of personality, weapons of truth which can be used with telling effect not only against rabid militarists, but also against his own positions.

"Militant America and Jesus Christ"

Abraham Mitrie Rihbany in "Militant America and Jesus Christ" takes up another approach to the problem of Christian militarism. Despite the military ardors of the church through many centuries there is a feeling that will not down that Jesus could not countenance any war even as a method of righteousness. This conviction which possessed the whole church for the first two centuries still gives no end of trouble. Mr. Rihbany, resting in part upon his peculiar qualifications for interpreting Jesus because he, too, was born in Syria, tackles his problem bravely. Here you find no damaging admissions of the essentially unchristian character of war:

"I want every mother who has torn from her heart and home a son and has sent him willingly to the battle line to feel that her son is not fighting against Jesus Christ nor trampling under foot that divine love which wells forth so copiously in her own breast. I want every American mother who has a son at the front to feel that the precious gift she has given to the nation has been offered not upon the altar of Moloch, but upon the altar of Christ and of the sacred duty which every free man owes to mankind."

We have not space to examine at length the exegesis of the

Gospels by which Mr. Rihbany establishes his position. It is sometimes helpful, but is open to serious criticism in detail and is vitiated by certain preconceptions which may be made clear by quotations:

"And it is most reassuring, indeed, to know that even the gentlest souls realize that when a hyena is snarling in the front yard, the giving of a talk to the children on 'kindness to animals' is not the best means to meet the demands of the occasion."

We pass over the questions whether the state of mind revealed by this comparison of a nation to a hyena is reasonable, whether war is not the cause rather than the cure of the atrocities upon which Mr. Rihbany elsewhere dwells, and simply ask: by what right do followers of that Jesus who taught forgiveness and the infinite worth of every human soul, liken not one man but a whole nation to the hyena?

To prove how "a noble person and a peace lover may justly use physical force" Mr. Rihbany quotes John's account of the cleansing of the temple and concludes his comment thus: "So the Son of man forged his own weapon and struck with it as the defender of humanity's eternal heritage."

We shall not argue whether the correct interpretation of the Greek permits one to believe that Jesus used the little whip on the men or only on the animals or stop to point out the absurdity of believing that physical force enabled one man to drive out a small army of merchants from the temple. What we do insist is that to wrest the spontaneous use of a whip into an argument for the use of the wholesale destruction, the lies, the immoralities of war is to show a lack of grasp of reality which disqualifies a man as a competent interpreter. It is another illustration of incorrigible romanticism.

Indeed, one puts down the book with a feeling that the author has reduced Jesus to the level of a Syrian teacher who wanted his neighbors to stop their rather silly brawling, but had nothing very distinctive to give mankind. There is little or no hint of the supreme message of Jesus' life, of the meaning of the cross as the revelation of God's way of dealing with evil.

A careful reading of both these books must raise the question, is Christianity practicable as a religion for society as well as for individuals? Fortunately there is a book under that very title which seeks to answer the question.

"Is Christianity Practicable?"

Dr. Brown wrote "Is Christianity Practicable?" before our entry into the war, but his book is still timely. It is longer than either of the others, perhaps less eloquent, but much more judicial in tone, and is inspired by that skill in analysis and desire for fair statement which characterize the author. He believes war in its essence to be unchristian. It is necessary now, pacifists are mistaken, and their case is rather summarily dismissed, though Dr. Brown pays tribute to their courage, sincerity and value to the world. But the present necessity of war does not prove that Christianity is impracticable. He saves himself and Christianity by a belief in progress that will conquer war.

There is much sound sense and genuine idealism throughout his discussion which supports the belief in Christianity as the ultimate hope of the world. Yet somehow the book leaves us

"Militant America and Jesus Christ." Abraham Mitrie Rihbany. (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 65c. net.)

"Is Christianity Practicable?" By William Adams Brown. (Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25 net.)

cold. At vital points it hedges. The author apparently is one of that rapidly diminishing band who still cling to the delusion that a "nation may arm itself in the interest of peace." His answer is not "Christianity is practicable," but "it *may* be practicable." Such a faith will not conquer the world and is far removed from the religion of Jesus. It is cautious, evolutionary, melioristic; Jesus is radical, revolutionary, creative. Perhaps it is the great service of the war to give emphasis to this unique aspect of true Christianity, revolutionary not only in ideals but in method.

The books we have reviewed here differ widely; yet they and many others miss this supreme challenge of Jesus to the nations. They are at least hopeful in that they do not sink to the abysmal depths of the preachers of Hate.

To say these things is not to rail vainly at the war that is passing—God knows it has had its own idealists and heroes—but it is to point out what we verily believe to be a type of thinking about Christianity and its applications to life which is dangerous to the new world for which, no less eagerly than ourselves, these authors work and dream.

"The Report on Reconstruction" Prepared by a Sub-Committee of the British Labor Party

(Issued as a supplement to *The New Republic*, February 16th, 1918. Price 10 cents)

The New Republic has deserved well of its readers and indeed of the American public by its reprint of the Report on Reconstruction prepared by a sub-committee of the British Labor Party. This document still awaits endorsement by the party as a whole; but we should gather that little exception is likely to be taken either to its main tendency or to the specific projects outlined in it. It is obviously the work of economic thinkers of rare vision and ability and it may rank well among historical documents of the highest class. We are, however, less impressed by its particular proposals than we are by its spirit and outlook. It is impossible not to feel that we are here dealing with a new thing in the literature of politics; and we believe that the future historian will put his finger upon this paper as the point at which a new idea of the first magnitude made effectual entrance into political theory and practice. So constant is the pressure of this idea that it breaks out here and there through the discussion of concrete economic measures in swift gleams of corroborating light. "The first principle of the Labor Party is the securing to every member of the community, in good times and bad alike, (and not only to the strong and able, the well-born or the fortunate) of all the requisites of healthy life and worthy citizenship." That is the keynote, and the document repeats it again and again; and we repeat that this is a new thing in practical politics. Every period of political history is governed by some master idea; liberty, empire, individual rights, and so forth. The note of the coming period is already announced in the broad and generous humanism which this document reveals as the characteristic impulse of the British Labor Movement. In this report, British labor appears to assume definite leadership in the creation of the political and economic framework of the new world.

"New Ventures of Faith,"

(The General War Time Commission of the Churches, 105 East 22d Street, New York. 15 cents.)

To announce "a monthly prayer cycle for general use" is not usually considered interesting; yet the appearance of this manual is an event of uncommon significance in the life of the church. You must more than read, you must use this book to appreciate its fine quality. It gives carefully selected subjects for each day in the month, covering the whole range of human relations. For each subject there are suggestions for thanksgiving, penitence, and intercession; and rich stores of literature have been used to supply the daily meditations.

The co-operation of many minds which went into the making and distribution of this book is itself a fine expression of Christian unity and comradeship of spirit and effort. Already, we believe, denominational and interdenominational agencies have ordered upwards of 40,000 copies of this manual. A chief agency in its distribution is the General War-time Commission of the Churches, which is using it to promote the effective observance during March of a special month of prayer throughout the nation. That such a Commission should so use a book which contains no hint of narrow nationalism, no trace of hate for the enemy, but only the universal passion of Christ, is a sign of promise for the future. Out of such prayer as this book will stimulate, a transformed church may be born.

Who's Who Among our Contributors

HENRY J. CADBURY is professor of Biblical Literature at Haverford College, Pennsylvania, and a member of the Society of Friends.

SYDNEY STRONG is minister of the Queen Anne Congregational Church in Seattle, Washington, and a moving force in every organization for social betterment in the North West.

RICHARD ROBERTS is minister of the Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn. He was formerly a Presbyterian minister in London.

WILLARD L. SPERRY, formerly Rhodes Scholar at the University of Oxford, England is now minister of the Central Congregational Church of Boston, Mass.

The New World

is published by The Fellowship Press, Incorporated (at 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.), established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued, not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

The Fellowship Press, Inc.: Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.
Editorial Board of *The New World*: Norman M. Thomas, Managing Editor; Edward W. Evans, Harold A. Hatch, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Richard Roberts, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward, and Walter G. Fuller, Secretary.

Contributions to *The New World* should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope if reply is desired.

The New World is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy, annual subscription one dollar. Orders for copies, subscriptions and all correspondence should be sent to *The New World* at the Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The facts about the war aims and peace terms of the warring nations are to be found in

APPROACHES to the GREAT SETTLEMENT

By Professor EMILY G. BALCH
With an introduction by NORMAN ANGELL

A concise account of official and non-official discussions relating to the settlement of the war, beginning with President Wilson's Peace Note of December 12, 1916;—with a valuable bibliography.

Mr. Norman Angell says in his Introduction :

"For the purpose of forming a sound public opinion, upon which a wise diplomatic strategy can most securely be based, some intimate knowledge of the data so clearly analyzed and presented in this volume is indispensable."

Price \$1.50 net; at all book stores

Published by
B. W. HUEBSCH,
225 Fifth Ave., New York City

THE NATIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES BUREAU

organized to help maintain our constitutional liberties in wartime, announces the publication of the following pamphlets on the immediate issues confronting American citizens.

A set of one each of these publications will be sent upon receipt of fifty cents. Any citizen will be put on the Bureau's regular mailing list upon application. Contributions to the work of the Bureau or to the National Defense Fund for aid in special cases of injustice, should be sent to the Bureau at 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

PUBLICATIONS

Conscription and Liberty of Conscience

	Price Per 100	
Conscription and the Conscientious Objector (Aug., 1917) including leaflet (Nov., 1917)	8c
War's Heretics, a plea for the Conscientious Objector (Aug., 1917) Norman M. Thomas	8c	\$2.00
Exemptions from Military Service in Great Britain; U. S. Senate Document No. 62 (July, 1917)	8c
"Black 'Ell," by Miles Malleson, an English play depicting the revolt of a man out of the trenches	25c

Civil Liberties

Why Freedom Matters, by Norman Angell (Jan., 1918)	8c	\$1.50
Liberty in War-time; the situation in the U. S. in view of English experience, by Alice Edgerton (Jan., 1918)	8c	\$1.00
"Who are the Traitors?" (Jan., 1918) ..	1c	.50
Constitutional Rights in War-time (July, 1917)	Free	Free
The Outrage on Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow at Cincinnati	8c	\$2.00
The Truth About the I. W. W. (Facts in relation to the pending trial) (Jan., 1918)	5c	\$3.00
The "Knights of Liberty" Mob, and the I. W. W. Prisoners at Tulsa, Oklahoma (Jan., 1918)	8c	\$1.00
The Case of the Christian Pacifists at Los Angeles, by Norman M. Thomas (Jan., 1918)	8c	\$2.00

Check the publications you want, sign with address, cut out and mail.

Name

Address

TO THE FELLOWSHIP PRESS
118 East 28th Street, New York City

I enclose \$1.00. Please send **THE NEW WORLD** to me for one year beginning with the February
March
April number.

Name _____

Address _____

If you have not yet subscribed, fill out this form and mail **TODAY**

**To
Our
Readers**

**If you believe that
THE NEW WORLD has a
message for forward-looking
people will you not help us get
new subscribers? The copies
you personally send or give to
your friends bring the best
results. Will you not therefore
fill in and send us the form
printed below?**

**The Editors
"The New
World"**

To the
Editors
The
New World
118 East 28th Street
New York City

Please send me _____
sample copies of *The New
World* for use in making it more
widely known among those likely
to be interested.

Name _____

Address _____

Please fill out this form and mail **TODAY**

THIS MARK ON GOOD BOOKS



YOUR PART IN POVERTY

By
GEORGE LANSBURY

In reviewing this book in *THE PUBLIC*, Alexander Mackendrick says:

"It is written by one who both knows and cares how the poor live, and should be read by every American citizen of whatever political opinion; whether engaged or not engaged in reform or uplift agencies; whether concerned or unconcerned in the social problem."

\$1 net; at all bookstores

Published by

B. W. HUEBSCH, 225 Fifth avenue, New York

**A
Specialist**



**In
Democracy**

"The war, as we are now agreed, has developed into a bitter struggle between Democracy and Autocracy, and in questions of Democracy *'THE NATION'* may call itself something of a specialist.

"It is because of this that *'THE NATION'* approaches the present crisis, huge as it is, with some sense of familiarity and with a supreme confidence in the outcome. If Democracy is at stake, as it has appeared to be, then the entrance of America into this vast struggle can, to *'THE NATION'*, mean but one thing. For, to a journal committed to democratic principles as the most effective of human instruments and convinced that this country holds such principles dearer than life, it would be inconceivable that the forces of Democracy should not prevail.

"Now it is quite possible that America may gain a real blessing from this bitter war by finding the corrective for an easy-going philosophy.

"Revolutionary changes cannot be expected without a preliminary chastening of the spirit. Europe has now had that chastening. The force of individual character has been felt, and the great sacrifices of nations have been seen to be the accumulated sacrifices and sufferings of individuals. The losses and sufferings which even America must expect by entering this war will, let us hope, prevent her, as by force of habit she has done in the past, from thinking of Democracy as a prize easily achieved and secured."—From the Editor's speech at the Semi-Centennial Anniversary Dinner. Try an experimental subscription. Clip the coupon.

The Nation
20 Vesey Street  N. Y. City

Address The Nation, 20 Vesey St., N. Y. C.
\$1.00 enclosed, send *'THE NATION'* for a four-
months' experimental subscription to

mc *Conductor* *new World*
"THE CHARACTERISTIC DEMAND OF CHRISTIANITY IS FOR A NEW WORLD."—G. K. Chesterton

The New World

A Monthly Journal of Christian Thought and Practice

Vol. I. No. 5

MAY, 1918

10 Cents

The One Course for Us is Penitence

The League of Friendship

George Lawrence Parker

A Biblical Cartoon of Nationalism

Henry J. Cadbury

The Island of Sorrows

Richard Roberts

The Principles of Social Peace

Charles A. Ellwood

Applying Social Ideals to the Ministry

By a Young Minister

*U
HX1
W89*
The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street

New York, New York

To THE FELLOWSHIP PRESS

118 East 28th Street, New York City

I enclose \$1.00. Please send THE
NEW WORLD to me for one year
beginning with the
number.

Name.....

Address.....

If you have not yet subscribed, fill out this form and mail TODAY

To the Readers of "The New World"—

If you believe that
THE NEW WORLD
has a message for
forward-looking
people will you not
help us get new sub-
scribers? The cop-
ies you personally
send or give to your
friends bring the
best results. Will
you not therefore
fill in and send us the
form printed below?

The Editors
"The New
World"

To the
Editors
The

New World

118 East 28th Street
New York City

Please send me.....
sample copies of *The New
World* for use in making it more
widely known among those likely
to be interested.

Name.....

Address.....

Please fill out this form and mail TODAY

JOHN BROWN: A BIOGRAPHY FIFTY YEARS AFTER

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Thomas Wentworth Higginson said:

"It may be safely said that there now remain very few of the personal friends of John Brown, of Osawatimie, who will not be surprised and deeply impressed by Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard's large and mature memoir of him. It is, as the author calls it, 'A Biography Fifty Years After,' and I can only say after reading from first to last, it's more than 700 pages, that I have never encountered anything this side of Gibbon's 'Rome' which has made me feel more the personal power of a single work."

John T. Morse, *Editor of American Statesmen Series*, declared:

"The story has the movement of a Greek tragedy, with its simple beginning, then its creation of the sense of personal nearness, then its vague foreboding of terrible disaster, and finally its grand and fatal close. Perhaps in thus dramatically fashioning his volume Mr. Villard obeyed an instinct rather than acted upon a preconceived plan; that is often the case with great work, where a writer's feelings are deeply enlisted. Be this as it may, the merit and charm are none the less; he has seized well a splendid opportunity and has written one of the great biographies of our literature."

Fully illustrated with portraits, and
other illustrations

With copious notes and bibliography. \$5.00 net
postage 26 cents

Boston HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY New York

The New World

Vol. I. No. 5

MAY, 1918

10 Cents

The One Course For Us Is Penitence

"The one course for us is penitence. . . . We must go out against Germany, not as righteous against wicked, but as penitent against impenitent. That is our only hope."
—Vida Scudder in "The New World."

THE glory of man is his unconquerable faith that what ought to be must be. He is made for freedom and he will not rest until he has won on earth the liberty of the sons of God.

In this passion for justice and for freedom is written the ultimate doom of German dreams of empire. Generations of schoolboys have admired the invincible spirit of the Romans who auctioned the land whereon Hannibal's army was encamped. You could not defeat such men; and yet their courage has been surpassed in our own day by men and nations who dare to plan for a new world in the very moment when an enemy more terrible than Hannibal, possesses himself of some of the fairest lands of earth. Such plans as President Wilson and the British Labor Party have avowed are not proof of folly; rather they are the presage of victory.

But the road to that victory is neither short nor easy. Two dangers threaten our hopes. The first and most obvious, that which has turned the earth into an armed camp and Europe into a shambles, is lest the German war-lords triumph and usher in a new age of ruthless imperialism. Against the final triumph of such tyranny, even in this hour of darkness, we are guaranteed because it is naked and open; seen in the eyes of the world for the evil thing that it is.

The second danger is less obvious and apparently less pressing. Precisely because it is subtle and easily ignored it demands our attention now ere it grows to greater strength. The danger is that the nations—especially our own America—shall win at terrible cost a victory in the name of humanity, of justice, of freedom for small nations and oppressed peoples, only to find that masking behind the most disinterested motives that ever inspired nations at war or sent their young men

forth to die, were forces of brutality, of coercion, of injustice, which will turn victory into defeat, set up new oppressions and sow seeds of new wars.

Nowhere is that danger greater than in America. We are so sure that we possess that liberty which is the envy of the world that we are honestly hurt by criticism. It is just this complacent self-righteousness which is our great weakness. Our impenitence mocks our only hope.

The evidence, alas, is abundant and close at hand. Our moral indignation at German atrocities is a driving force in the war, yet that moral indignation has not removed even for the period of the war the shame of our own lynchings. Recently in the single state of Louisiana in the space of thirty days, four negroes were lynched—three because they were accused of stealing hogs. In Tennessee women and children were holiday spectators while a negro accused of a double murder was first fiendishly tortured with red hot irons and then slowly roasted at the stake.

These are only the outstanding injustices of our race problem. We deny to the negro ordinary social and economic rights; in large areas of the country we give him imperfect education or none at all, and exploit his ignorance; employers use him to keep down the standard of wages, and white laborers refuse him admittance to their craft unions, while the mob lynches him (as at East St. Louis) for the crime of being a scab.

There are signs of penitence and progress, but as yet there is neither penitence nor progress sufficient to cure this festering sore which poisons our democracy. Our mental reservations against real liberty for the Negro have made hypocrisy a habit of mind, have kept us from facing facts and have fastened economic serfdom more securely upon both black and white. Is it small wonder if those

Germans who are not entirely ignorant of our affairs hesitate to trust the sincerity of our claims as champion of the rights of oppressed and outraged peoples? May it not yet prove our tragedy and the world's that when at last victory comes, we who have not solved our own Negro problem will find ourselves impotent to bring about that brotherhood and justice between the varied races of the earth without which all our hopes of durable peace are vain?

The tendency to slide into brutality and tyranny is not confined to our dealings with the Negro, as the record of high-handed injustice in labor disputes abundantly proves. Sometimes the ruthlessness of oppression takes legal form as in the Mooney case; sometimes it is wholly lawless as in the Bisbee deportations or the lynching of Frank Little at Butte. The war has given peculiar impetus to this sort of thing, for under the pretext of patriotism and suppression of "pro-Germanism" men can be assaulted and even lynched almost with impunity. It is a striking fact that the victims of the patriotic mobs are never the pimps and panderers who destroy the morale of our soldiers, or the profiteers who are Germany's best allies, but very often some labor agitator or reformer who has incurred the fear or dislike of the business interests. So it was in the case of the Rev. Herbert Bigelow and in the Tulsa outrages; while for the abominable lynching of Praeger in Illinois it is difficult to find any sort of rational explanation. When one looks behind the mask of patriotism in all these cases, what hideous forces of ignorance, cruelty and selfish interest stand revealed! To the world's sorrows may yet be added this cup of bitterness, that victorious America who has prevailed against "the lawless Hun" cannot secure elemental justice for her own citizens.

Deeper than these crimes of violence, lies our fundamental lack of appreciation of what freedom means, or why it matters. Discussion is the a b c of freedom: where that elementary right is abridged by public opinion or by a governmental department, freedom is denied just as surely under elective officials as under hereditary monarchs.

Today in America the liberal and radical press is terrorized; a large number of papers, some of them strongly pro-war, have been barred from the mails, either for one or more numbers or altogether. In effect, under our present legislation, the Postmaster General is controller of what

people shall read and that means, in large degree, of what they shall think. For this situation and its danger to liberty not one official but a heedless, unreflective public opinion which supports such autocratic legislation is responsible. That same public opinion apparently supports the conviction of Christian speakers who cannot reconcile war and religion; and applauds the indictment of Scott Nearing and the editors of *The Masses* for the sort of criticism of the war that has been accepted as a matter of course in England.

The consequences are very plain. We have in the President the outstanding leader of our time. His foreign policy is the hope of the world; yet it has behind it no body of organized public opinion in America and its real understanding and support are found in the British Labor Party. Why? Because thought and discussion have been systematically discouraged by public opinion, under the guidance of the Tory press and reactionary labor leaders, preachers and college professors, and actually repressed by the very government of which Mr. Wilson is the head.

Repression of radical thought—even when it is wrong and foolish—drives it underground. The government not only imprisons all the I. W. W. leaders, but even holds up the mail in which the I. W. W. appeals for defence funds, unmindful of the fact that the degree in which government departs from justice is the degree in which the radical labor revolt becomes more dangerous. The President himself has told us that the returning soldiers will not long endure our present system of "economic serfdom." * Nothing can permanently check the mighty stream of economic radicalism; but repression of discussion can erect great dams across it which ultimately will fall. And when they go, the waters which might have flowed as a river of new life will come upon America as a devastating flood.

It is no use saying that we are giving up our liberties only for the period of the war. It is precisely now that freedom matters. We shall no prove our superiority to Prussianism by adopting Prussian methods. Now, if ever, we need though and common counsel lest the great and terrible instrument of war becomes not a liberator but Frankenstein's monster.

We speak plainly. Our American atrocities, or

* This phrase is taken from the President's remarkable letter of Mar 20, 1918, to the Democratic Party in New Jersey.

sins against the freedom we profess to serve, prolong the war. For our hope of true victory still lies in hastening the day when the workingmen of Germany will see how they are duped by their masters, how their lives are used as pawns in a gigantic game of world domination. We by our own acts give our bitter and unscrupulous enemies a chance to deride the President's leadership of just men everywhere who look for the peace of righteousness. And if at last by using "force without stint" we defeat the Germans, we may find that our denials of freedom at home have left us spiritually unprepared to secure and to enjoy the peace for which we have poured out our blood and treasure.

Some day the nation or party will arise which believes in its cause so utterly and trusts democracy so entirely that it will be assured of its triumph without coercion of opinion. It will welcome discussion as its weapon of victory; it will rejoice in freedom of thought, of speech, and of the press as the very life blood of liberty. Then, and not till then, will the battle against inequality and brutality and oppression be won. America is capable of greatness and generosity. She has heard the cry of the oppressed across the seas. She believes herself called to a holy war; will she repent then of her own cruelty and intolerance and fear of thought, and become in very truth God's crusader for a new world?

Signs of the Times—an Editorial Survey

In the Shadow of That Battle

It is easy enough to use words about the "greatest battle in the world's history," but at best they will be commonplace—utterly inadequate to tell what we feel. Around the world men and women and little children live in the shadow of that battle; it controls their thoughts, even their acts, and holds in its tense grip their hopes and fears and loves. There in Northern France and Flanders for more than a month vast armies have engaged in titanic combat; humble conscripts, men from factory and field, have done deeds of incredible daring that put to shame the courage of the knights of old. Now and then the smoke and confusion lift and we get a glimpse—as of Brigadier General Carey and his improvised army stopping the gap through which the German wedge was almost driven; but for the most part it is an anonymous conflict where British, French and Americans resist the German madness.

It would, of course, be absurd for us to attempt the role of military critic. Undoubtedly the German army has accomplished an amazing military feat, whatever the ultimate results may prove to be. But the leaders, forced to desperate measures by internal unrest or still lusting for power, have taken tremendous risks. If, in spite of the prodigal slaughter of their young men the German war lords can show only a gain of a few miles of battle-scarred earth—if the Allied armies still remain intact, the channel ports uncaptured, and a victorious peace nowhere in sight, the day of reckoning with an outraged people may be nearer than otherwise we might dare to hope.

Will German Workers Support a Junker Peace?

There have been moments during the war when a decent negotiated peace seemed in sight. It must be confessed that nothing of the sort is true just now. It is still open for the "non resistant" (who really believes in the highest sort of moral resistance) to say that his way is by no means dis-

credited, for it has not been put to the test, but in the present crisis the believer in political negotiations must hold silence.

It is now clear that the imperialistic peace in the East and the hope of German success in the West have corrupted the Reichstag majority, so that they have abandoned all profession of standing for a peace of no annexations and no indemnities.

We are absurdly handicapped in any attempt to appraise the situation among the German people by the fact that we can get no German papers and are dependent upon such extracts from them as come by way of England and the neutral countries. Conscience is not wholly dead in Germany, but if we may believe an apparently dispassionate discussion of "German Socialists and the Interallied Manifesto" in a recent issue of *The New Statesman* (London) even the Socialist paper *Vorwärts* now takes a cynical view which rejects the allied socialists' ideals as incapable of realization by anything short of victory by the Entente. It is not hard to see how difficult it is for radicals and idealists to work for ideal ends in a triumphant military state; nevertheless, there will be no clean peace unless the belligerents agree on a just program regardless of nationalistic aspirations of greed or revenge. Surely the working class which has least to gain from a narrow nationalistic peace will recognize this fact in Germany as they have in no small degree in the allied countries; but victory is a poor teacher of justice. Appreciation of this elemental fact doubtless inspired the President's famous and much misunderstood phrase, "peace without victory."

The Players and the Pawns

It is, for example, the fresh hope of military victory which is responsible for the abatement of the Austrian yearning for a peace of conciliation. Nevertheless, the evidence of that desire contained in the French version of the letter of Emperor Charles to "My dear Sixtus" is so sensational as to be important even in the midst of the German drive. That letter, written a few days before America's entry into the war, gave astonishing

recognition of the rights not only of Serbia, but also of France in Alsace-Lorraine. If, as we are inclined to believe, the letter is genuine, it goes far to explain the course of allied diplomacy toward Austria. It raises, however, questions of enormous importance. Why was such an overture fruitless? Was it a clever trap? Did fear of Germany block further negotiations or were the Allies over-confident in their demands on the basis of America's potential strength? When did our Government learn of the letter?

But whether this particular letter is genuine or not, it is a cruel and dreadful thing that millions of lives of honest men should be the pawns of the secret and autocratic diplomacy on which this astonishing episode sheds new light. If the world cannot talk peace just now while the German drive is at its height, it can at least remember this new illustration of the necessity of common counsel between peoples instead of the secret and cynical machinations of war lords and potentates.

The President Speaks

As was to be expected, the President's Baltimore speech on the first anniversary of our entry into the war, was a renewed dedication of the United States and all its resources to the struggle against the sort of Junker peace the German Government has imposed on Russia and now apparently seeks to impose on the world. Against this he pledged "force to the utmost."

At the same time he did not, as some commentators have assumed, declare for a "knock out blow" against Germany but against a false, imperialistic peace. The distinction is of the utmost importance. The President specifically left the door open for a peace of justice, and in his condemnation of the Central Powers he distinguished for the first time not only between the guilt of the war lords and the people, but between that of the military high command and the civilian Government. It is a thousand pities—to say the least—that our editorial writers have not endorsed this significant part of the President's program with the same enthusiasm they have shown with regard to its pledge of "force to the utmost."

Loyalty to What?

"After the war is over all these foolish pacifist creatures will again raise their piping voices against preparedness and in favor of patent devices for maintaining peace without effort. Let our people be on their guard against them."—From Colonel Roosevelt's Portland Speech.

In the interest of the unity of America's war aims, and the ardor wherewith our men fight, we should like to raise these questions in the minds of our readers:

First: Is not the formation of a League of Nations one of America's primary conditions for a clean peace?

Second: Is the League of Nations, endorsed by the President and by the best sentiment in all allied countries, one of the "foolish patent devices" to which Colonel Roosevelt refers?

Third: Are not thousands—even millions—of men fighting, sacrificing and dying because they believe that by so doing they may make this the last war?

Fourth: Are such men likely to be very patient with such views as are here expressed by Colonel Roosevelt?

Fifth: Colonel Roosevelt's loyalty to America, the political entity, is undoubted, but in his contempt of all forces for keeping peace, other than his cure-all of universal military training

and service, does he not show greater loyalty to the spirit of Prussia than to the spirit of America?

In this connection it is gratifying to note that the Senate recently defeated Senator New's amendment to the Military Service Act, which was designed to fasten upon us a permanent policy of universal military conscription. But that one defeat by no means removes the menace. The friends of after the war conscription are very active. There is still the danger, as Senator Williams said, lest we fall to the level of Prussianism,— "the level of barbarians; the level of war seekers; the level of institutions and societies founded upon a military past, seeking throughout all the years of peace to prepare itself for war provoked by itself. Whenever you turn a people into an armed camp, you at once give them the ambition to provoke war in order to show how well prepared they are for it."

The Senate and the I. W. W.

We go to press too early to comment on the I. W. W. case now on trial in Chicago.

We had intended to publish in *The New World* an article setting forth the background of the I. W. W. trial, not in any sense as a special plea for the I. W. W. or as a justification of all its methods or philosophy, but simply in order to promote a fair understanding of this complicated case. That task, however, has been very much better done than we could hope to do in the limits of our space, in a pamphlet issued by the National Civil Liberties Bureau, entitled "The Truth About the I. W. W.," which we have reviewed elsewhere in this issue.

Mr. Robert Bruere, whose recent series of articles in the *New York Evening Post* on the I. W. W. and conditions out of which it has grown cannot be too highly appreciated, recently called attention to the remarkable debate in the Senate on March 21, which, as he says, was carried on "in the tone and spirit of a medieval tribunal engaged in the extermination of witches." He adds that it is this sort of temper which explains the origin of the I. W. W. The occasion of the debate was the introduction of a bill permitting the Government to take such steps as may be necessary to acquire spruce and other lumber for ships. Colonel Disque, who has been in charge of spruce production on the Pacific Coast, urged this legislation in order to get prompt action, and added "the patriotic action of the employers and employees has been beyond question." It is important to remember that a great number of those employees are members of the I. W. W., who have responded loyally to the fair treatment which Colonel Disque has given them.

Senator Jones, of Washington, opened the attack on the bill. He talked at great length but never touched on the immediate subject; the larger part of his address was given over to an eloquent denunciation of the I. W. W. Senator McCumber and Senator King joined in similar vein, so it came to pass that under cover of denunciation of the I. W. W. urgently needed war legislation was delayed if not defeated. Senator Jones has many powerful constituents who would look with some apprehension on the Government's bill to commandeer lumber. We wonder if that helps to explain his attitude. While employees are working steadfastly without striking, the Senatorial friends of the employers defeat necessary legislation. Which class better deserves Colonel Disque's praise?

Victories for American Labor

The last few weeks have seen notable events in the field of labor in Chicago. The arbiter, Judge Alschuler, granted most of the demands of the employees of the stock yards, including the eight-hour day, better wages, equality of pay between men and women for the same sort of work, and more decent working conditions. A clean-cut decision like this gives new hope in arbitration as a method of industrial progress.

But perhaps the most significant event of the month in the labor world has been the agreement of the Labor Policies Board, composed of representatives of the employers, of the American Federation of Labor, and ex-President Taft and Mr. Frank P. Walsh, representing the public. The Board agreed upon a comprehensive plan for adjusting disputes. On the one hand organized labor won a sweeping recognition of the principle of collective bargaining; on the other hand the employers won the adherence of organized labor "to the principle of universal arbitration so applied as to outlaw all strikes for the term of the war."

This agreement of the Labor Policies Board has been since confirmed by executive order of the President. Its success will depend upon the loyalty of individual employers and employees and the courage and skill with which the Department of Labor administers it.

While the American Federation of Labor was willing to yield voluntarily to the principle of universal arbitration, its opposition has been strong enough to defeat a clause in the Sabotage Act which would make strikes illegal in war industries. This is as it should be. It would be good for the liberties of America if organized labor would show the same zeal in defending freedom of thought that it bestows on the defence of the right to strike.

Prohibition—and After

In an uncertain world few things seem so likely as the adoption of the national prohibition amendment. The surprising fact that the Massachusetts Legislature voted to ratify the amendment, and that in Albany the ratification was only defeated after a long, and none too edifying, political wrangle which will make prohibition the great issue in the State election, seems to forecast the complete legislative triumph of the cause at an earlier date than any but the most optimistic foes of the traffic in alcoholic liquors could have anticipated.

One does not need to believe that prohibition will bring the millennium to recognize the tremendous gain to society if the power of alcohol can be even partially lessened. The drink evil has involved in its curse not only the guilty but the innocent unto the third and fourth generation and has piled high its cost in every human value that men hold dear.

Nevertheless, we hope that those crusaders who have borne the burden and heat of the long battle against the saloon will recognize that it is never enough to drive out any demon from the body politic. If this is all we accomplish there is always the danger that other devils worse than the first will enter the house which has been swept and garnished.

Prohibition as a mere negative written into the constitution of the United States will not suffice; it must be sustained by a wise and generous appreciation of the sort of living against which the liquor traffic has always been arrayed. We hope the

leaders in the prohibition campaign will continually urge the necessity for satisfying that natural desire for comradeship and for relief from the dull routine of mechanical tasks and bitter poverty which have ever driven men to the treacherous joys of strong drink. In other words, we hope all good prohibitionists will rejoice not "as he that taketh off his armor" but as soldiers enlisting in the greater war for a new and wholesome social order.

The New Orthodoxy—Revised

At its meeting in New York, which began on April 10, the House of Bishops considered the case of Bishop Paul Jones, who had resigned at the request of a Commission appointed at a previous meeting of the House of Bishops. The following action was taken:

"First, the House of Bishops declares its belief that the Government of the United States has obeyed the law of moral necessity in seeking to stop a war of deliberate aggression by the only means that are known to be effective to such an end.

"Second, the House of Bishops believes that any member of this House is entitled to the same freedom of opinion and speech as any other citizen of the United States, but in the exercise of this liberty he should be guided by a deep sense of the responsibility which rests upon one who occupies a representative position.

"Third, the House of Bishops is unwilling to accept the resignation of any Bishop in deference to an excited state of public opinion and therefore declines to adopt the report of the special commission, or to accept the resignation of the Bishop of Utah for the reasons assigned by him in his letter of December 20."

After this action by the House of Bishops, Bishop Jones offered his resignation, because he felt that a situation had been created in Utah in which it would be impossible for him to do effective work. This resignation was accepted, and the following resolution adopted:

"With full recognition of the right of every member of this House to freedom of speech in political and social matters, subject to the law of the land, nevertheless, in view of Bishop Jones's impaired usefulness in Utah under present conditions, recognized by himself, the House of Bishops accepts the resignation of the Bishop of Utah as now presented."

Those who love the Church and the kingdom of God as well cannot but be thankful for this qualified recognition of the right of a Bishop to declare the whole counsel of God as he sees it. The spiritual successors of Peter could scarcely do less. Perhaps we owe much to the rather inept report of the Commission which seemed to recommend that the utterances of a Bishop should be controlled by the state of public opinion. Their bluntness at least brought the issue to the light. Certainly we owe much to the large number of men and women who, although they do not share Bishop Jones's view as to the relation of Christianity and war, nevertheless felt themselves compelled to stand boldly against the doctrine which would make the Church of the living God the meek handmaid of the political state.

While we rejoice in this partial vindication of liberty of conscience for the Christian minister and of the independence of the Church from either political control or the tyranny of an "excited state of public opinion" we regret that the whole affair was so managed as to deprive the Diocese of Utah of the service of a man of high character and singular fitness for the post.

"What of the Church?"

We regret that we are obliged to hold over till next month the continuation of the discussion on "What of the Church?"

The League of Friendship

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

“MY friends,” said Emerson, “have come to me unsought; the good God gave them to me.” But it was hardly such a promiscuous idea of friendship that Jesus had in mind when he promoted the disciples from servanthood to the higher plane. “Henceforth I call you not servants but friends.” Here is something that combines the charm of free friendship with the efficiency of organized association.

These two aspects of relationship form the charter of the Christain Church and must permeate her self-consciousness. What Jesus left on earth was this, a League of Friendship.

The church is today mightily challenged to live up to her “new name.” For distrust and suspicion have borne their fruit in such war as man never knew before, and it is more incumbent on the church to root out the germs of war than merely to destroy the symbols. Sunlight, air, sanitation, purity have killed our human diseases; and only these, on the spiritual plane, will root out the infection of war. War, in essence, is a filth disease. The League of Friendship must be the dispenser of the new sanitary method of securing good health among men.

It is evident that the Church as the League of Friendship has in part “failed in her great task of happiness.” If she is to succeed in the larger and newer task now before her she must searchingly inspect her life before she proceeds to work. All of her social schemes and noble ideals, coming down from the days of Frederick D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley to Jane Addams and Walter Rauschenbusch will amount to little unless some cleansing is done within. If the land where she would build is malarial, she must drain the swamp before building her temple. By the side of the undrained bog of human hatred the church cannot and must not try to build her proposed House of Love for the nations of the earth. Yet this has been the tendency of our haste in the last twenty-five years. To say that this has been the tendency carries no more of condemnation than of congratulation; but it should carry, beyond balanced praise and blame, warning for the future. The error has been that we have said, “Come, let us improve each other; and by all means let us im-

prove the other fellow.” What we first should have said is this, “Come, let us honestly love each other, and above all let us supremely love the other fellow. Let us kindle our fire and then let us warm our hands all the way round.”

I

Begin, if you will, with the local church in the community. There apply the test. Is it a League of Friendship? The open attack of evil against the organized agent of “the good,” and the unproven complaints of the ignorant, we may expect and disregard. They are “part of the job.” But within the League itself friendship is often absent. The sins of the grandfathers come down and sit in the pews of the children, recalling and keeping alive the strifes of the past in an unexplainable fashion. Vital and energetic cooperation against the common enemy is impossible in the presence of this infecting ghost. The inherited hatred nullifies all advance, although a force of fresh fighters is eagerly waiting behind the front to push forward to the charge. Oftentimes the long waiting destroys their freshness and the church never receives the help that they once offered. We might in these days find some excuse for the delay if our civil strife within the League of Friendship were due to deep and vital differences in theology. For the old theological battles had a glory about them, a glory of pain and dire necessity. But the petty strife that often now marks local church life is unworthy of schoolgirls and schoolboys.

To disagree is human; to differ and co-operate is divine. It is some consolation to find that Jesus met human pettiness in his chosen group, the Twelve. His cosmic hope for our redemption, his goal of universal dominion over human destiny, a vision we are just beginning to appreciate, was rudely interrupted by “the dispute among them which of them should be the greatest”! And the request of an ignorant mother that her two sons might sit nearest to him in his glory is pathetically repeated in the churches of today. The foundations of the League of Friendship shook with fear not because sin and evil attacked them, but because selfish desires ate out the cement of Love’s humility.

And how strangely the world-deluge since 1914 has painted the same picture! The hatred between the nations that at first clothed itself in such fine phrases as "Teutonic against Slavic influence," "the clash of differing civilizations," is now being seen in truer and less glorious colors. At first we saw the grandeur of a huge volcanic eruption and, though it frightened us, we were tempted to admire the flaming horror. But now we see the sluggish, ugly lava-streams and lava-beds, and the gray ashes over the landscape. The glory of the sky has died out! The hatred that seemed glorious has, in large measure, moved its quarrel into the back yards of the nations, and has come to have the rancor and sourness and shame of domestic broils. In Russia the chief interest lies now in the age-long quarrel between her reactionaries and her progressives. In Germany it is now the well-known strife between individual initiative and freedom against solidified efficiency under the iron heel of selfish imperialism. In Great Britain it is once more the deathless Irish problem. In America it is plainly, though not so clearly as in the other cases, simple idealism and liberty against materialism and greed. And in France M. Briand cried out just before he left the Premiership, "How can a minister conduct a war, how can he perform the duty of governing, when all his time must be spent in meeting the attacks of politicians in the chamber, and all his energies devoted to political considerations and not to those of national defense?" How familiar this all sounds. How strange that each nation needed the light of a universal conflagration in order to learn that the rubbish in its own cellar was smouldering!

II

But to return to the League of Friendship. The business of the Christian Church is to extract the poison of hate from the whole international body politic. If in cold calculation men produce Hymns of Hate, and glory in the shame of it, the church must meet the challenge and set her house in order, so that she may teach them how not to hate. Says Mr. James Oppenheim in a striking verse:

"Would you end war?
Create great Peace—
Go, search your heart, America—
Turn from the machine to man,
Build, while yet there is time, a creative peace,
While there is yet time!

For if you reject great Peace,
As surely as vile living brings disease,
So surely shall your selfishness bring war."

As we look at the matter now with our new-created eyes it seems amazing that we had forgotten that to teach men how not to hate is the one purpose of the Cross of Jesus. "To break down walls of partition," "to remove the enmity," "to make of twain one new man, thus making peace," are magic phrases in the light of the present fierce tragedy, but we had forgotten them, or accepted them as old platitudes! We have too long talked of the Cross in terms of theology; we must begin to talk of it in plain human terms. We have too long thought in terms of personal salvation; we must henceforth speak in terms of a redeemed world-order. All that gathers about the Cross, in affection, is of the fabric of friendship. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst" is as vital and touching a definition of friendship as literature contains. If the League of Friendship but wakes to its true inner nature no one can fail to see that from it shall flow all of the healing streams of life. For where there is opposition to the Cross of Jesus, either the opposition of open enmity or that of carelessness and ignorance, there hatred is sure to grow; and it is the same hatred whether seen in the malicious gossip of a church, or in a town meeting, or in a family quarrel, or gorgeously robed on the stage of international war.

It is plain, then, from the insidious nature of human hate that the League of Friendship must demand more of its members than it has ever demanded before. In passing we should point out that such liabilities as modern life imposes on the church can only be met as she accepts the challenge in Jesus' words, "Henceforth I call you not servants but friends." This fits the life of today, while the older appellations do not fit. By the abolition of our old social and industrial divisions modern life has brought men so close together that we can hear each other breathe. We work together in crowds and come out of offices and factories and theatres shoulder to shoulder. All classes are bound together in a sympathy both of pleasure and labor that the older world never knew. Social life is no longer exclusive but democratic. The fellowship of the "movies" and of the dance-hall is in part evil, but in part it is just modern normal good feeling seeking relief from

self and loneliness. Once more we must quote Mr. James Oppenheim in his striking sonnet, with the significant title of "Folk Hunger"—

"Fierce hunger has come upon me,
I am starved for men and women—
I want to go where the crowd is thickest,
Where the spot-light man colors the graceful favorite
on the stage with green, then gold, then violet—
Where the audience roars at the jocose comedian and
the strong stout woman. . .
Where I will be accepted, not by the earth,
but by my fellows;
Sinking back into rough good commonness,
just a laughter and idler myself,
Warming the hands and heart of my soul
at the blazing hearth of the people.
Tomorrow business with the lordly Earth,
Sessions with myself in aching privacy. . . .
Tonight, crowds, lights, gayety,
The cockles of my heart roasted crisp as nuts,
And my lung-bellows roaring in the jolly
brotherhood of the world."

No other age than ours could have phrased the matter in just that way. It is a voice from a close-packed, hard-worked, good-natured but unsatisfied world. It is a voice from a world where our mechanical devices have set so fast a pace for our emotions that our spiritual natures are left crying in the street like a child deserted by the bigger children. It is really a prayer that the bigger boys will come back and include "the little fellow" in their gang; in their League of Friendship.

And here we strike the real truth. If the church today is to satisfy the crying world with something higher than "comedians, strong, stout women, and lights and gayety" we must learn the joviality of the world without its evil, conviviality without intoxication, good humor without coarseness, fun without frivolity, friendship without ambition or narrowness or pretentious morality. Jesus was called a glutton and a reveller because, without their accompanying evils, he radiated good cheer and love of life and laughter which food and drink are thought to produce.

III

We may now be able to state a few of the principles of the League of Friendship, although only the barest outline is here possible.

The warmth and geniality of which we have just spoken does not exclude but rather emphasizes the need of severe moral discipline. Personal discipline is the first demand on the members of the

League. We must bite our own lips until they bleed rather than let those lips by unkind word cause another heart to bleed. In private contact and in church and social life we must sacrifice the seeming glory of self-assertion to the harder glory of self-sacrifice. "Seventy times seven" must be a practice, not a dream. The greatest stride forward the Christian Church can now take is to banish forever from her vocabulary all words that have supped poison from the rank weeds of hate, and to use either the speech of sincere sacrificial love, or, where that seems impossible, to practise the curing grace of silence. Such a change in the conduct of the church would soon attract more notice from the world than flaring bulletin-boards.

If this seems a negative method, there is not lacking a positive one. The League of Friendship must seek out active and positive ways to express the meaning of its charter to others. It must find out how all of us differing people can live together, for to get along together is the main business of human life. The League must discover the terms on which we may have true association with people whom temperamentally we don't like, individuals races, nations, states, sects and organizations. God has mixed us all in together here, "of one blood" yet of many tempers; and unless we are seriously going into the business of killing-off all of those whom we do not like, we must find a way to stick it out together! In a paradox it may be said that the League of Friendship must be the world's teacher of the fine art of loving people whom we do not like! The human process, up to date, is to love those whom we first like. The way of Jesus is to love first and learn to like afterward! It is a wonderful reversal! It is the only way that is psychologically and spiritually correct. It is the only way that will ever work.

The whole platform of the League might be expressed in the terms of the sympathy of Jesus. The marks of its members are these—a genuine outreaching of the heart toward all men; a high valuation of the world that we really live in, with all of its noises and ugly sights and dear faces and country hedgerows; and last of all, a self-control which furnishes a spiritual gymnastic as severe as military training, but which leads to freedom in the end.

The opportunity points us forward, beyond the close of the war. Is the Christian Church yet fully awake to her share in creating the atmosphere

of the new peace? The church as such will doubtless not be officially represented at the table when the compact of peace shall be signed; but the League of Friendship must be there invisibly, if not visibly. The business of the present hour is to create such an attitude toward the new peace, and especially toward the Central Powers, as shall be strong enough to do the work of love after the war is over. To defeat an enemy is often the demand of righteousness, but to ostracize him and to buffet him afterward is not the work of righteousness but of inflated egotism. In punishing children it is desirable to defeat the evil spirit in the child which had for the time grown so strong that it mastered and imperilled the good in him. But after the evil is defeated, by force if necessary, then further force turns into a battle not against the evil but against the good. Prolonged and unreasoning punishment always means an attack against the very good in whose interest the battle was at first begun.

And this will be exactly the case in this historic struggle unless the public mind of Christendom can be taught by the League of Friendship to talk more sanely of Germany and her allies than many are now doing. That we must defeat the Central Powers is positively true, thoroughly defeat them. That the sting of this defeat may last long may also be true. But that wilful, bitter, long-drawn-out hate and venom should last for generations to come is entirely unthinkable. The League of Friendship must declare her charter in no uncertain terms. The Central Powers are our enemies, enemies of mankind, and must be punished; punished not because they are our enemies but because to use Prof. Royce's figure, they have proven traitors to the spirit of the Beloved Community which humanity was fast coming to be. This evil spirit of betrayal must be defeated; the enemy of good will must be conquered. But once conquered, what shall the good-will then do? Shall it then become the evil will, and adopt the very spirit which originally it sought to cast out of its enemy? And in that case who would be the real victor?

Much of the popular talk of "the war after the war" is of this type. It is the business of the League of Friendship to render such unreasoning processes, in season and out of season, impossible. And this high task is in perfect keeping with her patriotic purpose that the evil spirit of German Imperialism must be cast out. The defeat that

the League of Friendship seeks to impose on our nation's present enemies is such as a parent seeks for a wilful child, a defeat not intended to exile the child from the family but for the very purpose of showing him how he may happily continue to be one of the family circle. And we seek to defeat Germany solely because we wish the whole world to be a real "Beloved Community"; and the world cannot be such a community if any nation is excluded. Hence, the vital purpose of the war and our victory is plain; it is to bind our enemies once more into "the family" with the cords of love which they rudely and wilfully broke, and which for the moment now lie torn and bleeding.

This has always been the missionary spirit of the Christian Church, and is the passion of Jesus Himself. Never before has the church had a like opportunity to show the fundamental reality of the Master's words, "Love your enemies." The crux of the present situation is this—that if we defeat our enemy and yet allow the spirit of hate to become our own, if we come to hate our enemy instead of hating the spirit that has prompted his mistake, then it will be love itself that shall be the defeated party in this war. Between ourselves and our enemies we have slain not each other but the hope of humanity. No wonder that we call this a world tragedy; for it will be such unless the League of Friendship can hold the bridge safe for the passage of love from the old time into the new time. It is not either the Allies not the Central Powers that are in danger of annihilation in this struggle. It is humanity, love, hope, faith and idealism that are in danger of utter destruction. And the League of Friendship must assert unequivocally that from now on her doctrine is not victory for the Allies alone, but victory for all humanity. And America must watch more carefully than she is now doing her popular speech about the enemy whom she ought to love and not to persecute. This is all a paradox; I grant it; but it is as plain as day that it is the only understandable way out of the tragedy.

And if this truth prevails, the sorrowing world will be able to say to the League of Friendship, after the war—and both victor and vanquished will join in the tribute—

"Me too thy nobleness has taught
To master my despair;
The fountains of my hidden life
Are through thy friendship fair."

A Biblical Cartoon of Nationalism—Jonah

HENRY J. CADBURY

"And this is the tragedy of the Book of Jonah: that a book which is made the means of one of the most sublime revelations of truth in the Old Testament should be known to most people only for its connection with a whale."

VERY few Christian laymen can give an intelligent reply to the question, What is the message of the Book of Jonah? The incident of the "whale" has completely overshadowed the main point of the writer, and having been made the crux of orthodoxy, receives, as is unfortunately the case with many speculative questions raised by the Bible, more emphasis than does the really significant moral teaching. There is a strange agreement between believers and sceptics in rejecting it as a miracle—the former do so by elaborate arguments to prove that it could have happened naturally, the latter by frank disbelief. But even those who accept the story of the Book of Jonah as literally true often take it scarcely seriously, but with a smile at the submarine experiences of the ill-starred prophet. And herein is the real misfortune, not that they smile at the story, but that they smile at the wrong place. For there is real humor in the book, but the humor, as we shall see, is the grim humor of absurd human narrow-mindedness.

The Book of Jonah receives its place in the Old Testament canon because of the person of its hero. "Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, who was of Gath-hepher," is mentioned casually by the Book of Kings in connection with the extension of the kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam the Second. He was therefore a contemporary of Amos and perhaps of the other prophets of the eighth century B. C. His home was in the hills of lower Galilee near the Nazareth of later times. No further record of his preaching is given and the book that bears his name not only was not written by him but does not even give, as do most of the books of the prophets, the outline of his message. It is, rather, a narrative about Jonah and appears to have been written several centuries later. As in the Book of Daniel, and as frequently in the later Jewish and even modern writings, the author has selected not a purely fictitious character but some real person of the past as the basis of his story, and has filled in the setting from his historical imagination. In Jonah the setting is far from

detailed. Nothing is said of Israel's history or conditions, and concerning Nineveh only its size and its wickedness are mentioned. The story is told with the utmost simplicity and—to our Occidental eyes—with a kind of grotesqueness. The successive stages of the story are mechanically brought on as by a *deus ex machina* without much regard for natural processes. The incident of the gourd is really as strange as that of the fish. It is to be noted that just as Jehovah sent out the storm and "prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah," and spake to the fish to vomit out Jonah, so he "prepared" in turn "a gourd," "a worm" and "a sultry east wind" to teach a final lesson.

To our modern mind the realism of the psychology of the story contrasts most favorably with this Oriental artificiality of plot. The sailors in the storm are described with real dramatic skill. Their religious fear amid danger and their regard for Jonah and his God, if not entirely according to our ways of thought, are nevertheless fully intelligible. So is the loving kindness of Jehovah for the great, ignorant masses of Nineveh and his compassion even for cattle. And it is in the character of Jonah, drawn in a few sketchy lines, that the real teaching of the book is to be found.

The narrative is simple: Jonah the prophet is commanded to preach against Nineveh. At first he tries to escape this duty by taking ship for Spain (Tarshish), at the opposite end of the earth, but is brought back. The second time he perfunctorily obeys the command and immediately the city repents. But why did Jonah disobey? Stubbornness, laziness, timidity, fear of being discredited can hardly be the reasons. It is apparently because he really wished Nineveh to be destroyed and was afraid that if he preached the city would repent and be spared by God. This is shown in the peevish "I-told-you-so" when afterward he says to Jehovah:

Was not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I hastened to flee unto Tarshish; for I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful, slow

to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness, and repentest thee of the evil. Therefore, now, O Jehovah, take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live.

Jonah is represented as a man of selfish, narrow interests. When he is given a message of doom to a foreign city he refuses to preach it, lest the city should repent and be saved. Finally compelled against his will to be the instrument of such a truly merciful mission, he is angry and sulks despondently as though life were not worth living. He is disgusted to have become, perforce, himself the savior of those whom he would gladly have seen destroyed. He is chagrined, not because his prediction did not come true, but because his own intolerant ill-will for the Ninevites is discredited by their sincere and ready response to his half-hearted warning. It is an almost ludicrous contrast that is presented, not unlike that of the Pharisee and the Publican in the New Testament parable—inside the city the whole population, king and people, and even cattle, repenting with fasting and sackcloth; outside the city the querulous prophet sitting and waiting with malicious hope. Each is thinking of God's possible forbearance, the one imploring it, the other deploring it.

Two other contrasts accentuate the wilfulness of Jonah's hatred for Nineveh. One is this same impartial benignity of Jehovah, which is the hope of penitents but the despair of the self-righteous; the other is Jonah's own concern for the destruction of a simple gourd vine. Both are brought into relief in the closing verses. When the gourd is destroyed Jonah is just as angry as when the city was saved, and again he says, "It is better for me to die than to live."

And God said to Jonah, Dost thou well to be angry for the gourd? And he said, I do well to be angry, even unto death. And Jehovah said, Thou hast had regard for the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: and should not I have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six-score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?

Thus the story of Jonah becomes, like the story of Ruth, a parable, or a tract to meet the national exclusiveness and racial pride of the author's times. This writer did not outspokenly oppose the current patriotic conceit. To do so is often ineffective, and even dangerous. But he uses two meth-

ods of correcting it indirectly. First, like Amos and other prophets, including Jesus himself, he shows God's own catholic loving-kindness for other nations than the people of his special choice and implies that a similar catholicity is required of men. He uses theology as the teacher of ethics. His second method is caricature. In Jonah he gives us the current nationalism—in a *reductio ad absurdum*. Nineveh, the capital of an aggressive military despotism, was the classic historical enemy of the chosen people. Jonah represents the acme of national antipathy. That Nineveh is guilty the author freely confesses. God knew its guilt and yet wished to save it. But Jonah is too good a patriot for that. Though God himself commands it, he will take no part in giving aid or comfort to the enemy. He is fully aware of God's broader sympathy. But he condemns it and bends every effort to avoid sharing it. He will defy God rather than be like him. He neither believes nor wishes to believe any good of the Assyrians. He knows they are wrong, and he is glad they are. He would leave them to their deserts. He wants justice, not mercy, and he wants it to the bitter end. He has sympathy enough, where sympathy agrees with his own interests—sympathy even with an ephemeral gourd that might have saved him a headache; but for innocent alien populations of thousands of ignorant and misguided human beings he feels only petulant rage. In extreme type, Jonah is the natural outcome of the moral pride of Pharisaic Judaism, or of the more modern national prejudices artificially fostered by war.

A Statesman's Message

"Like most Englishmen, Earl Grey was spiritually shy, and only now and then let me see what was moving him, and moving him very deeply. These moments were unforgettable. I seemed for a second to see his soul straining to know if I had apprehended the uttermost truth of his spirit which he shrank from uttering. He said to me once: 'You know the idea of those words—he being dead, yet speaketh? A voice from the grave often gets a hearing. That's what I'm after. I want to try and make my voice sound from the grave. I want to say to people that there is a real way out of all this mess materialism has got them into. I've been trying to tell them for thirty years. It's Christ's way. Mazzini saw it. We've got to give up quarreling. We've got to come together. We've got to realize that we're all members of the same family. There's nothing that can help humanity, I'm perfectly sure there isn't, perfectly sure, except love. Love is the way out, and the way up. That's my farewell to the world.'"

From Harold Begbie's "Life of Earl Grey."

Hysteria

"He that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city."

Attorney General Gregory has done the country a real service in pointing out that not one fire in the last year has been traced to an enemy alien. Mr. Hoover's bureau had previously announced that in an investigation of thousands of cases of supposed ground glass in bread, only one had been proved, and in that case the culprit was a disgruntled employe.

Doubtless there is a spy menace which requires the careful attention of competent Government agents, but greater than the spy menace is the danger of developing a national hysteria. Considering our great number of enemy aliens, our freedom from serious trouble—despite the movies and magazine thrillers and amateur detectives—has been remarkable. In Wisconsin some of our German-American citizens doubtless voted for Mr. Victor Berger, inspired more by pro-Germanism than pro-Socialism, but neither there nor elsewhere have they offered resistance to the draft or otherwise justified the sweeping suspicion which some writers and speakers and patriotic societies have sought to arouse against them.

It is an unfortunate fact that the overt acts of violence have been committed, not by citizens of doubtful loyalty, but by mobs in the name of patriotism. The President does well to write to Dr. William E. Bohn:

"It distresses me beyond measure that suspicion should attach to those who do not deserve it and that acts of injustice and even violence should be based upon that suspicion."

The hysteria which lies behind mob violence may also serve to explain the drastic legislation extending the already broad provisions of the Espionage Act. As we write, the bill is in conference and its final form uncertain, but it seems reasonably clear that it will be broad enough to permit heavy punishment of any act of criticism of the Government behind which there is suspected to be a motive not merely of disloyalty but of opposition to the war. Colonel Roosevelt's yell of criticism was unnecessary as far as he himself is concerned. It is the mischief of this type of legislation that it operates against the relatively powerless and unpopular radical critic, but not against the partisan Republican. It is one thing to give administrative discretion to the executive branch of the Government; it is another thing to give even the best intentioned Department of Justice the power to prosecute a man, either on its own initiative or on the demand of hysterical or self-interested "patriots" for exercising what we have heretofore esteemed as the ordinary rights of free speech whereby democracy was safeguarded.

But Senator Chamberlain is not satisfied even with this drastic legislation. He has actually introduced a bill giving courts martial jurisdiction over *all* offenses under the wide and indefinite range of the new Espionage Act. We hear that the administration is opposed to the bill.* It is almost certainly unconstitutional. We cannot believe Congress will seriously consider so deadly a blow to the civil liberties that made America a country worthy of our love; but that it should be introduced by a lead-

ing Senator and supported by responsible officers of the Bureau of Military Intelligence, is cause enough for concern.

More indicative of national hysteria than the new Espionage bill itself, is the argument urged for it by responsible officials who say, to quote one Senator: "If we do not handle the situation adequately, it will be handled by popular justice through mob courts and lynch tribunals." Even the mayor of Collinsville had the effrontery to telegraph Senator Overman, demanding the imposition of heavy penalties—not against lynching itself, not against the kind of incompetency in office which permitted Praeger to fall a victim to the mob; not even against the saloons who sold the stuff which served to feed the flames of the mob's passion; but against "disloyalty," the very thing of which it is now admitted Praeger was not guilty.

Indeed, to yield to this hysteria by recognizing it in legislation is but to increase its strength throughout the country. By a curious coincidence, on the same page of a paper which contained an argument that mob violence could only be cured by sweeping legislation against disloyalty, there was an item which recorded the fact that in Oklahoma a pacifist already under indictment by the Federal Grand Jury was tarred and feathered by the mob! There is not safety from the mob even in prison. The convicts in the penitentiary at Santa Fé tarred and feathered Major Birkner, an army officer who was awaiting trial for alleged pro-German remarks!

That these are anxious days, every one will admit. The strain upon the public temper is perhaps greater than it was even in the dark days of the Civil War. There is every reason to demand efficiency from the Government in dealing with actual spies, but hysteria of the sort that has been growing in America, fostered too often by the leaders of public opinion, is an enemy which must be conquered if we are to be worthy of playing a great part to make the "world safe for democracy."

Fables for the Day

II

EXPERTS WANTED

The Tenderfoot was having his First View of the Range.

"There seem to be a Good Many Horses over there on the Foot Hills," remarked the Cow-puncher casually.

"Horses? I don't See any," he replied. "Where are they?"

"Don't you See that Band just this side of that Far Butte?" said his Western friend, pointing into the Distance.

"Well," said the Tenderfoot, "I see some Black Dots over there. How on earth do you Know they are Horses?"

"Oh, it's just like Grunting to a Hog," was the reply. "I've been Using my Eyes on such things ever since I was Knee-high to a Coyote."

MORAL: MEN WITH SOCIAL VISION WILL BE NEEDED TO
SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF WORLD PEACE.

* Since writing this the President himself has confirmed this report in refreshingly vigorous language in his letter to Senator Overman of April 22nd.

The Island of Sorrows

RICHARD ROBERTS

AN officer of the British Imperial Government on service abroad, said in a letter to his young daughter at school in England, "Yes, as you say, Roger Casement has been hanged; but there must be something very much wrong somewhere that it should turn Roger Casement into a traitor." That Roger Casement was a man of exceedingly fallible judgment is clear from his pathetic faith that Ireland might hopefully look to Germany for deliverance, (for what concord hath Christ with Belial?); but it must have been a sense of intolerable wrong that stung this brave and chivalrous soul into such aberrations of thought and action as those which marked the last months of his life.

For the tale of Ireland's grievance is both long and terrible. For eight weary centuries the British have misgoverned Ireland. Burke in one of his great Indian speeches pleaded for "a policy of hazardous benevolence" in Indian affairs; and by and large the policy has prevailed. The very fact that India is awakening today to a sense of its capacity for self-government is to some extent (could the bureaucrats but see it) the inevitable fruit of all that has been "benevolent" in the British conduct of Indian government. It was this same policy in the hands of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman that achieved an incredible stroke of reconciliation in South Africa. But the British policy in Ireland (save for an occasional oasis of liberal idealism) has been marked by a dull and ill-natured incompetence. That monstrous superstition of "*strong government*" has produced a condition of almost hopeless insurgency. It has been urged by minds of the strait governmental type that the Irish people have shown themselves incapable of self-government; but the simple answer to this argument is that the English have done so badly in Ireland that the Irish could not possibly do worse. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in one of his stories makes two mutually jealous sea-captains engage in a ploughing match; and the verdict of the judges was: "Captain Hocken's ploughing is the worst we have ever seen, but we give him the prize, because we don't consider Captain Hunken's ploughing to be no sort of ploughing at all." The

English performance in Ireland has been no sort of government at all.

And the Irish people were the last people on earth to be handled by the methods of "strong government." If the Irish are traditionally "agin' the government," it is, I imagine, chiefly because the peculiar psychological bias of the Celtic peoples to insurgency requires very little stimulus; and Ireland has had much. The distinctive character of British civilization, its insistence upon the right of personal self-determination, is at root not a Teutonic but a Celtic quality. The contribution of the Celtic strain in the British make-up is the ideal of personal independence and free fellowship. This is why the Celt becomes so easily a schismatic and heretic. Pelagius, Lamennais, Feargus O'Connor, Robert Owen, William Wallace, Owen Glyndwr, Walt Whitman, Lafcadio Hearn—to throw up a jumble of rebel names at random—were either pure Celts or had Celtic antecedents. The Celt is at the best suspicious of constituted authority; but when authority sets out to suppress him or to make him toe a line of uniformity, it provokes an opposition which is both swift and invincible. The Celt is amenable to persuasion and conversion but not to physical force and coercion.

The climax of the age-long tragedy of Ireland seems to have come just as the dawn of a happier day was at hand. The great co-operative enterprise conducted by Sir Horace Plunket and George Russell, the poet, was beginning to effect a very profound economic improvement in the agrarian districts. The coming of Home Rule was assured. But behind that fair promise lay the sinister signs of that strange fatality which has always blighted the promise of better things in "the distressful country." Intransigent Ulster prepared to resist Home Rule by force; and Celtic Ireland took up the challenge. And then by the sheer logic of events came the tragedy of Easter, 1916. The English government had no more wit than to suppose that the situation could be dealt with by large and persistent doses of that fatal medicine of suppression which has been the chronic undoing of even the best English intentions in Ireland.

The consequence was, as an Irish Episcopalian clergyman told me, that in his parish for every one Sinn Feiner at Easter, there were ten in August.

Once more the clouds began to scatter; the Irish Convention was called. It was at last left to Irishmen to work out a plan of salvation for themselves. Hopes ran high as Dame Rumor reported an unusual spirit of accommodation; and the long sittings of the Convention showed that there was something doing. Whether the Convention would bring forth a great deliverance or a little mouse, it was at least something gained that Irishmen were at last facing their own problems together. We now know that the Convention failed to reach unanimity, but it did draw out a majority report the endorsement of which by Sir Horace Plunket was a sufficient reassurance for all normally constituted persons.

And then, on the verge of the apocalypse, the evil genius which attends upon British Governments in their dealings with Ireland got busy and wrecked the good hope. The British ministry came forward with a proposal in one hand to draft Irishmen into the British Army, and with a clumsy gesture of semi-concealment, kept the other hand behind its back with a Home Rule Bill in it. One can guess at the cerebrations which evolved this so transparently foolish policy,—but what charity can excuse it? Take another dose of the good old medicine first, and then you shall have the candy. The thing is so childish that it would be laughable if it were not so tragic.

And the upshot? God only knows. But what should be done is obvious. Let a Home Rule Bill be passed at once on the lines of Sir Horace Plunket's report; and let the new Irish Parliament meet without delay. The native generosity of the Irish people could be trusted for the rest. The Land League was to the ordinary English politician a spectre of peril and wrath, but its founder, Micheal Davitt, said that "the Land League represented the triumph of what was forgiving over what was revengeful in my Celtic temperament." There the true Ireland speaks. The malevolent blundering of centuries has not extinguished the infinite capacity for forgiveness and magnanimity in Irish hearts; and I believe that if English statesmen were at this hour to say to Ireland,—“Henceforth be mistress in thy own house,” in the twinkling of an eye she would erase the infamous past from her scarred memory and would pour forth

the treasure of her faith and manhood in common cause with her sister island, who would even thus at the eleventh hour have redeemed herself from the anomaly of professing to fight the battle of the small nations while misgoverning a small nation at her own side.

With Ulster, the trouble is only fear; and it would be unfair to suppose that her fears are without some ground. Both parties to the quarrel have made sad mistakes. But let Ulster also trust, and forgive; for there is no other cure for fear. And Ulster will fall incurably in love with her three fair sisters, Leinster, Munster and Connaught, when she lets herself get near enough to them to see their faces once more. But before that can be, she must make up her mind to close her accounts with the bankrupt firm of Carson and Smith.

The Litany of the Comfortable

Remembering Thy sacrificial throne,
We chosen guardians of revelation
Establish on the earth the Word's foundation
On men that groan.

We praise and magnify Thee, that of the seed
Thy martyrs planted who in anguish died,
We are the fruit indeed,
Consummate, justified.

Against inquiry and ardor's heat
Thy mercy we entreat;
From consequence untoward and perilous
Deliver us;

From rod and tribulation for Thy sake
Deliver us;

From slander, ruin and from social break
Deliver us;

From all excess of love and penitence;
From unproductive forms of violence
Deliver us;

From needless pain and execrated sorrow;
From the fool's paradise, unplanned tomorrow;
From hunger fell with its fell partner thirst;
From leprous blight of poverty accursed;
From exile, revolution and the rest
That Thou hast blest,
Deliver us;

And at the last, we pray Thee, of Thy Grace
From sudden death
Deliver us;

Lest it be truly as the prophet saith,
That in unsheltered space
We look upon Thy face.

—Viola C. White.

By the Way

I have just been looking through some of the publications of the United States Food Administration—one of the most valuable and efficient agencies of our Government, Senator Reed to the contrary notwithstanding. Of these very readable and informing pamphlets the most entertaining is perhaps Bulletin No. 5 for public speakers. It gives a dozen typical questions on food saving problems such as are most frequently put to public speakers, and then suggests the best answers with which the heckler can be overthrown. In nearly every case, the speaker gets much the best of the argument. Questioner No. 11, however, is a troublesome and tactless fellow. "Why should I go without," he asks, "when Mr. X keeps six servants and eats course dinners?" One feels instinctively that here a Socialist has cropped up in the audience. To this illbred question the Food Administration suggests only two replies. The first is: "See Matthew VII, 1: 'Judge not'; John XXI, 21: 'What shall this man do?'" If by any chance the questioner should seem to be not quite satisfied by this answer the speaker is recommended to follow up with the counter question, "What would you call a soldier who refuses to march because he suspected some other of skulking?" This versatile method of dealing with Mr. X and his six servants is expected to silence all further enquiry in that direction, and we pass quickly on to the next question. Whatever may be the impression left on the mind of the questioner, for my own part I cannot help feeling pleased at finding this unexpected familiarity in high Government circles with the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

* * *

It is gratifying to note that, so far, the news of what our own "Fatherland" Party is trying to do over here has not made any deep impression on the public mind in England and France. Thanks to President Wilson's strong and consistent refusal to yield to the demands of American militarists for a vast military establishment after the war, they still believe in Europe that America has entered the conflict with the vow "Never again" on her lips. For example, this is what Prof. A. F. Pollard says in his stimulating new book, "The Commonwealth and War," which is attracting wide attention in England:

"It was not to make the world more Prussian that we (England), and still less the United States, descended into the arena. They stepped down from their peaceful Olympus because it was clear that militarism could not be defeated by military peoples. . . . America has not cast its pacifism into the common cauldron of the war in order to make the whole world militarist, but to redeem it from the sword. . . . The old Europe, the old world, the old peace, had to die in order that a new Europe, a new world, and a new peace might arise from the hecatombs of war. An Easter will follow the blackness and desolation of this war to the confusion of those who dragged men into its depths."

* * *

I am reminded by Professor Pollard's reference to "old Europe"—the Europe of secret diplomacy, autocracy, and militarism—of a bitter saying in the recent "Life" of Sir Charles Dilke: "They talk of Europe! What is Europe?—A number

of wicked old gentlemen with decorations assembled round a green table!"

* * *

Mr. Hilaire Belloc has just published a timely new book called "The Free Press." With characteristic dash and daring he attacks the Press Censor and all his works. This quotation has pith and meaning over here:—

"Sound writing cannot survive in an air of mechanical hypocrisy. They [the venal press] with their enormous modern audiences are the hacks doomed to oblivion. We under the modern silence are the inheritors of those who built up the political greatness of England upon a foundation of free speech and of the prose which it begets. Those who prefer to sell themselves or to be cowed gain, as a rule, not even that ephemeral security for which they betrayed their fellows; meanwhile, they leave to us the only solid and permanent form of political power which is the gift of mastery through persuasion."

* * *

I wonder how many readers of this page saw the striking letter from Mr. Joseph B. Gilder that appeared in the columns of the New York *Evening Post* a few days ago. It seems to me to be well worth giving here in full:

"From the lips of a prisoner taken by the English in the course of the present German drive in Picardy has come the most imaginative and suggestive word relating to the great war that I have seen. The speaker was apparently a person of little note. Neither his name, his military rank, nor his occupation in time of peace was indicated in the dispatches in which his brief statement was quoted. What he said was this: 'We need all the land we gain, to bury our dead.'"

* * *

That there is a little clear thinking going on in Germany even in these days is shown by a report of a speech recently made by Dr. Dernburg in Frankfurt to a vast throng of people representative of all classes. According to the English *Cambridge Magazine*, Dr. Dernburg expressed *inter alia* these very sensible opinions regarding the question of indemnities:

"A war indemnity is not to be thought of. Which country should pay it? Daily we are spending between 120 and 140 million marks to keep this war going. What does it mean if perhaps after another year of war we get 12 thousand million as war indemnity? The value of the ores that lie in the provinces of Briey and Longwy has been estimated by experts: it amounts to as much as we can spend on twenty-five days of war. . . . Colonial acquisitions can hardly be counted as compensation for the cost of war. After sinking an enormous capital in German Colonies, the annual net dividend is about 100 million marks, the war expenditure for one day, from eight in the morning till six at night. . . . A Tirpitz peace would perpetuate present conditions and bind the nation in hopeless militarism."

* * *

Meanwhile another and more powerful German has been talking recently: "What have I not done," exclaimed the Kaiser on viewing a field of battle, "to preserve the world from these horrors?" At first one shrinks from the hypocrisy of the man, but on second thoughts I wonder: Does not this sound suspiciously like the cry of a tortured conscience?—or still more like the plea of a guilty man standing before the judgment bar of his people whose eyes will not forever be holden from the truth?

THE ROAD-MENDER.

The Principles of Social Peace

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD

THE Great War marks, we have rightly been told, the failure of our civilization. Instead of issuing in the Millennium, it has brought forth a calamity that threatens to engulf the world again with the black night of barbarism. For the moment the forces of chaos, brutality and unreason seem to reign supreme. Everybody seems to be under the illusion, if not that might is right, at least that might is the only effective means of attaining right. Nearly everybody, therefore, seems to want to fight somebody. Not only does Germany want to fight Britain, and the larger part of the world want to fight Germany, but many of the poor and less fortunate elements of society, not only in Russia but in other Christian countries also, apparently want to fight the rich and more fortunate elements. Even some "pacifists" and "conscientious objectors" want to fight somebody!

Perhaps no one is to be overmuch blamed for this general spirit of belligerency; for trust in force has come to dominate our civilization. The illusions that might is right or can make right, that human beings can profit by living at the expense of other human beings, that to dominate is the end of existence, have long possessed our civilization. And now, since physical science has unloosed and put into the hands of men the mighty forces of nature, more power for evil, as well as for good, lies within human control than ever before. In a civilization dominated by the worship of force, we must expect in such a situation constant appeal to it, not only to back up aggressive ambitions, but also to straighten out human problems. If one class fails to recognize fully the rights of another class, let the wronged class rise in its might and through revolution secure social justice. If one nation wrongs, or humiliates another, let the appeal be to arms and let might redress the wrong. But this way social madness lies! Even if human experience did not show this conclusively enough, the principles of social science sufficiently demonstrate it.

In cruder ages and under simpler conditions of life the appeal to force, perhaps, brought better social results than it does at present. But in the higher stages of civilization the use of violence

starts a process of rebarbarization which destroys the higher social values by which men have learned to regulate their conduct and which have made higher civilization. It, therefore, makes more difficult the adjustment of human beings in harmonious relations on a high plane. It usually defeats the very end for which it is supposed to be employed. Even though force may be at times rightly used to sweep away otherwise insuperable obstacles to the harmonization of human relations, as when we confine the criminal, it is idle to think that the solution of the problem of the relations of individuals, classes, nations and races can in a high stage of civilization lie in the employment of force.

For how do men succeed in living together harmoniously and advantageously? Manifestly by rendering each other mutual service, by mutual help in the work of life. Moreover, if the relation is to be most harmonious and advantageous, there must be relative equality of the service rendered. If A gives all to B and receives nothing in return, then manifestly A will soon be exhausted and perish. Again, if A gives more to B than B returns to A, the service will be unequal and again A must soon become exhausted and perish. If, on the other hand, B gives as much to A as A gives to B there is full reciprocity of service established. The relation is then harmonious because it is just, and association can indefinitely continue. Only when there is this relative equality of service rendered can there be a stable adjustment between individuals which can indefinitely persist. The basis of harmonious human living together, then, must be mutual service. It is the reciprocal conferring of benefits upon one another which makes possible happy adjustments between individuals and harmonious living.

Now, the principles by which nations can live together harmoniously are not essentially different from the principles by which two individuals may thus live together. We cannot have peace in the world anywhere without good-will, and good-will cannot long continue without justice. If we seek the principles of permanent social peace, accordingly, our first perception must be that no stable and harmonious relations between individuals, classes or nations can possibly be established upon

a basis of injustice; and that whenever an individual, class or nation despoils or exploits other individuals, classes or nations we have injustice. Yet individuals, classes and nations have all through human history been under the constant illusion that they can get good for themselves through the despoiling or exploitation of other individuals, classes or nations; that is, getting something from these latter for which they do not give or seek to give any equivalent return.

But men live together by the mutual exchange of services. While A may have profited for a time by despoiling B, yet as he has destroyed the basis of their common welfare, it cannot profit him in the long run, not at least in any social view of the matter. By despoiling B, A has exchanged a continuing benefit which might have come from reciprocity with B, for a temporary profit.

Now, this very simple analysis brings us to the heart of the social problem, the problem of the relations of men and of groups of men to one another. It is evident that only as the ideal of mutual service, of full reciprocity in conferring mutual benefits (or even, if need be, in mutual sacrifice) is realized by men in their living together that there is chance for stable and harmonious relationships and worth-while human living. Yet the very opposite of this idea has been one of the constant illusions of mankind, as we have just said. All through the Christian centuries the mass of men have continued to be under what we may call the "spoliation illusion," the illusion that they can live profitably at the expense of others, or can profit by the suffering of others. From this illusion has sprung the attempts of classes and nations to dominate or exploit one another. From this illusion also springs the belief that wrong should be repaid by wrong, that we may remedy evil by returning evil for evil. If one nation, for example, invades the territory of another nation to adjust some real or fancied wrong, it is simply returning evil for evil, and the trend of the whole activity must be for the parties mutually to destroy one another. Again, if one social class rises against another class to right a wrong by force, to "expropriate the expropriators," as the phrase is, then again, the only result of such action will be for the two classes to attempt mutually to destroy each other and so to destroy the basis of their common welfare.

That such methods can straighten out human

problems is clearly an illusion. They breed strife, hatred and distrust, and these rapidly become habits of thought, feeling and action and so make impossible harmonious human relations. Thus the employment of force accompanied by violence can never by itself harmonize the relations between individuals, classes or nations. Injustice cannot be gotten rid of by returning wrong for wrong, evil for evil.

This does not mean, however, that we should adopt, or attempt to live by, as individuals, classes or nations, a doctrine of absolute non-resistance. Such a doctrine would make it impossible to deal rationally with the criminal or with the insane man. It would also make it impossible to deal rationally with a criminal government or with a war-mad people. Rather the truth which we have tried to set forth and which all modern social science demonstrates, is that we should not attempt to remedy evil by returning evil for evil; for that is a doctrine of mutual destruction and no social good, no harmonious human living together, is possible upon that basis. Modern criminology and psychiatry show that even the criminal and the insane should not be dealt with upon that basis. The pathway to permanent social peace is, therefore, clear if the world is willing to learn it.

Practically this doctrine that no social good can come through men despoiling one another means that individuals, classes and nations should seek, when a wrong has been done, mutual conciliation. It is the conciliatory attitude, in other words, which opens up the way to the restoration of normal and helpful human relations. It is through the cultivation of the conciliatory attitude in our social life and in our international relations that there is a pathway to permanent peace among men. If wars between classes and nations are to cease and to be replaced by harmonious human living, conciliation must be held in more honor and become more popular than it is at present; for conciliation has been increasingly at a discount in the relations of individuals, classes and nations during the last decade or so. If this had not been the case, the present war and all of its horrors might have easily been avoided. And if conciliation does not come in to heal the wounds of the present war, it requires no prophet to predict even more terrible wars to come.

This is, of course, simply the old-fashioned doc-

trine of Christianity, a doctrine which we have been constantly told that the world has outgrown. It is a doctrine, however, which the world can never outgrow, but on the contrary will increasingly need as human relations become more complex.

Harmonious human society cannot be based upon a balance of egoisms in individuals or groups; its only basis, as it depends upon full reciprocity of services and even of sacrifices, must be mutual good-will and mutual understanding. The great mistake of much of our present social philosophy has been its endeavor to find a stable basis for human relations in the self-interests of individuals, classes or nations. The events of the present show clearly enough that such a basis is inadequate, and that the only road to permanent peace among men is through the cultivation of reason and love, or rationality and good-will. If rationality and good-will are the basis of all worth-while civilization, we should do everything to promote reason and love in our social relationships. But when we stir up strife, antagonism, hatred or distrust between classes, nations or races, we are not promoting a society in which reason and love shall rule, but quite the reverse.

Hence the social problem, the problem of the relations of men and of groups of men to one another, cannot be settled by force, but only by right, by justice. We shall try to show in a later paper what in practice this may mean in our present situation; but one thing is sufficiently clear, and that is, that *all of our social problems depend for their solution upon the peaceful development of our civilization along essentially Christian lines.* Let all of the belligerent elements in our social life remember that!

Behold!

O Thou that with a gesture canst control
All seas that roll;

O Thou that with a whisper canst assuage
All winds that rage:

Behold how softer than the human breast
The wild bird's nest!

Behold how calmer than the world of men
The wild beast's den!

WILLIAM WATSON.

From "The Daily News" (London).

The Society of Friends Bears Its Testimony

The recent Statement of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends is so clear and fair a presentation of a much misunderstood position that we give it here in full:

"This decisive hour of history summons our Society to make its utmost contribution to humanity's deepest needs. Believing that this requires us to meet the moral and spiritual issues of the times simply and fearlessly, we feel called to make clear our Christian faith as applied to war.

"Our Society's opposition to all war as un-Christian has been maintained throughout its history. In 1660 our forefathers declared:

"We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatever; this is our testimony to the whole world. The Spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil and again to move unto it; and we certainly know, and testify to the world, that the Spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of this world."

"These convictions have been re-affirmed by Friends in all generations and during the present war our Yearly Meetings throughout the world have given clear evidence that they are steadfast to the same principles.

"The basis of our opposition to war is much more than any single command of the Old or the New Testament. It is our faith that the way of love by which our Master, Jesus Christ, met and conquered evil, remains for His followers today the true method of combating wrong. For us, as for Him, this involves refusal to use means which, like war, violate love and defeat its ends; but it does not mean a weak neutrality toward evil. For us, as for Him, it means a life of action devoted to the heroic purpose of overcoming evil with good. The unspeakable sufferings of humanity are now calling us and all men to larger sacrifices and more earnest endeavors to put this faith into practice. To such endeavors we dedicate ourselves."

In accordance with this faith, we desire to maintain all our relationships today.

To our beloved country, we affirm the deep loyalty of grateful hearts. We long to help her realize her noblest capacities as a great Republic dedicated to liberty and democracy. But we believe that we best serve our country and all humanity when we maintain that religion and conscience are superior even to the State.

To President Wilson, we declare our appreciation of his steadfast and courageous efforts to keep the aims of the United States in this great conflict liberal, disinterested and righteous.

To our fellow-countrymen, who are following the leadings of conscience into ways where we cannot be their comrades, we give assurance of respect and sympathy in all that they endure. Finally,

For all men, whether they be called our enemies or not, we pray that the sacrificial love of Christ, stirring us to repentance, may reconcile and unite all mankind in the brotherhood of His spirit."

The Friends are proving their faith by their works in Reconstruction in France. Within the last few weeks a famous physician and a high army officer both back from France, have testified to the wisdom, courage and devotion of the Friends' Reconstruction Unit. Some of its work—at least on its physical side—has been wiped out by the German drive, but such catastrophes only spur brave hearts to fresh efforts.

The Open Forum

Fifteen Years in Prison

To the Editors of *The New World*:

The exclusion of the religious issues involved, the inability or unwillingness of lawyers to see and appreciate the position of a Christian non-resistant, and the denial of bail pending appeal following an extreme sentence, are the outstanding features of the second trial of Rev. C. H. Waldron, a Baptist minister of Windsor, Vermont, recently retried at Burlington, under the Espionage Act, on a charge of wilfully causing or attempting to cause disloyalty through his teaching of the Bible.

The elimination of testimony concerning the religious difficulties which Mr. Waldron experienced with members of his church and with the Baptist State officials on account of his Pentecostal views, was particularly unfortunate because these were the real source of the trouble. Mr. Waldron is not a representative of those among the ministry who believe that the principles of the Gospel require them to be social and economic revolutionists and that as true prophets they must pronounce doom upon the present system of competitive society which makes war inevitable. He never knew of this group until their sympathy was extended to him in his time of need. He belongs rather to the group of non-resistant sects who base their position upon a literal interpretation of the Bible. If Christian ministers are to be put in jail for preaching the Sermon on the Mount, it ought to be those who have positive convictions about the changes needed in the kingdom of this world rather than those who believe that we should wait for the Second Coming of Christ to establish the Heavenly Kingdom.

Perhaps it is inevitable that outside the large centers, it should be difficult to find lawyers who can enter heartily into such a case and bring out its real issues. Legal ethics seems to teach that it is right to challenge any statement or to deny any action, but to admit statements and actions and then to justify them by appeal to fundamental principles and constitutional rights, does not seem to be expected in ordinary cases. Mr. Waldron's case required the use of evidence to support principles. The fundamental issue involved was whether or not a literal belief in the Bible and the preaching of that belief is a violation of the Espionage Act. The case did not receive the kind of treatment to bring out the issue but was lost in a maze of charges characteristic of neighborhood quarrels.

The extreme sentence of 15 years at Atlanta imposed by Judge Howe and his refusal of bail pending appeal will do much to win the public to a realization of the real situation. This kind of treatment must not be kept in a corner. An appeal must be made to the highest court in the land, so that it may be known whether it is the purpose of our democracy to imprison such men for being true to their religious convictions.

Further information may be secured and contributions to the Defense Fund sent to the Secretary of the League for Democratic Control, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

HAROLD L. ROTZEL.

Socialism and Christianity—a Notable Conference

To the Editors of *The New World*:

A few men and women met recently in New York City to discuss the problems of Socialism and Christianity. There were three groups; one, Christian ministers and laymen of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, liberal, progressive, social minded; another, class conscious socialists, affiliated with the Christian church; the third, socialists, without church connections. The discussion was aimed to bring out points of agreement and difference, rather than to formulate definite policies. The following thoughts seemed to reflect the attitude of those present.

There seems to be little doubt that progressives and radicals can unite in accepting the ethical teachings of Jesus, as guides to a program of social reconstruction. Believer and non-believer alike recognize that the Sermon on the Mount is in the main an appeal to what is best in man, a call for universal brotherhood, a message of social peace. However, the non-believer does not go any further. Creeds do not appeal to him. He cannot accept the miraculous and supernatural. A rationalist, he is willing to subscribe only to the purely moral, that which relates to man's dealings with his fellows. In this connection, the concept of Social Service and Responsibility is emphasized as the underlying principle of all revolutionary propaganda. Under the present system, there has been an over-accentuation of the individual—of his needs, desires and rights. The radical movement, on the contrary, is concerned with the principle of social welfare and social responsibility, seeking thus to promote the full development of the individual from the social point of view.

The non-church-going radical is mistrustful of organized religion—the church. Perhaps rightly so. The church is dominated and controlled by the property-owning classes who are the beneficiaries of the existing social and economic order. The church has generally arrayed itself on their side. To the workers, its ministers have preached docility, humility and subservience. Rarely have they ever stood out on the side of the downtrodden, and when they did, dismissal followed almost instantly. But the religious attitude and the religious emotion are realities—they are potent forces shaping the spiritual life of man. They must be preserved and organized. The only possible solution is a *free church*—a church devoted to service and spiritual guidance, but free, untrammelled, controlled by its worshippers, not by a privileged few.

What is particularly repugnant to the followers of Jesus, is the insistence of the socialist and syndicalist on the Class Struggle. This seems so inconsistent with Jesus's doctrine of Love, that the true Christian finds it almost impossible to ally himself with the radical movement.

But the difficulty is not real. The revolutionary radical does not preach the class struggle; he does not exhort the proletariat to hate and fight the capitalist and landlord. Such a notion is due to a hasty examination or misconception of the doctrine of class struggle. The radical merely points out that under the present system of private property, there is an opposition of interests between the owner and the worker. It is obvious to all that have eyes to see. The land owner lives on the rent paid to him; the greater his income, the less left to the land user. The owner of the means of production depends on profits to satisfy all his desires; the greater they are, the less left for the worker. The contrary is equally true. The opposition is real and bitter; one has only to think of the endless procession of strikes, the demands of the workers for higher pay, or its equivalent, shorter hours and better conditions, and the stubborn resistance of the propertied classes to all such demands. This is the condition that actually exists. The radical does not create it—he calls the attention of the world to it, and exerts all his energies to abolish such a brutalizing, inhuman and unchristian state of things. He does not aim to substitute one dominant class for another. His one purpose is to abolish classes altogether, and by placing the ownership and control of the sources of life in the hands of all, to create one great brotherhood of producers, brain and brawn workers—a class where the spirit of love, the divine essence of the teachings of Jesus will be able to exist and to make human association a realization of the dreams of the prophets.

It is by participating in such a movement that the true Christian can best serve his God, and thus hasten the coming of the Day, when the Golden Rule will not be merely a wish, a hope, but a living reality.

ALEXANDER FICHANDLER.

Applying Social Ideals to the Ministry

BY A YOUNG MINISTER

IN spite of the periodic attacks upon the ministry and the subsequent improving discussions on the subject in the religious press, there is a growing group of young ministers who feel that their attitude toward their work is either unknown or misunderstood. If this failure to see and to understand came only from the ultra-orthodox church group or from the ultra-materialistic radical group, it would be taken as a matter of course. But when it comes from intelligent students of economic and social problems who look to the church at least theoretically, as a possible ally in bringing in the new social order, it shows a pitiable lack of contact between those who ought to be co-workers in one great cause.

I have before me an article published by a leading weekly journal presenting in rather stereotyped form the intellectual, social and financial limitations of the ministry. The comment of the editor is that of a man who seeks to explain to his readers why the calling continues to exist. In substance, the answer is: "Yes, the ministry does have serious intellectual, social and financial limitations. But then, every profession has its drawbacks and the ministry may not have more than others. Besides, we must remember that the ministry is a spiritual calling and as such 'has meat to eat that we know not of.'"

Dr. Charles M. Sheldon takes up the same theme in an *Atlantic* paper, "Human or Superhuman":

"Within the church," says Dr. Sheldon, "there is a profound feeling on the part of thoughtful ministers and laymen that something is fundamentally wrong. . . . I am not writing a wail or a whine or an excuse, but I honestly believe that the great body of church members and people calling themselves Christians do not understand the superhuman task required of a human instrument called a minister."

He then states concretely the superhuman task which he has in his own parish in caring for the public services, the parish calling, the sick, the Bible school, the finances, the church organizations, and the music, besides attending to his studies, his civic duties and his family. Then follows this statement: "Is it any wonder that your boy does not care to enter the ministry? Would

you enter it again, knowing what you know of it now?"

Now to some of us all this kind of talk about the ministry is beside the point. The fact of the matter is that the primary factor in our "call to service" is not the choice of a profession at all but the challenge of a great task. The inexorable logic of modern social and economic facts has forced us to see that the real task of religion today is inextricably wrapped up with the revolutionary changes in society demanded by the Gospel of Jesus. Our own individual experience and our study of history have made us confident that these changes can be accomplished only through the power and inspiration of true religion. We recognize the church as one of the human instruments which has been used in times past to further those ends, but we also realize that she has often been the bulwark of reaction and repression. We have chosen the work of the ministry as a means of working out our vision of a better world, first, because we believe that the organized church must be won to a whole-hearted support of the reconstruction of society, and, second, because the work of the church gives us the opportunity to preach and to practice those spiritual truths without which the solution of the problems of modern society is impossible.

Preaching and Practice

Let me illustrate this attitude toward the ministry by relating an incident from my own experience. A strike broke out in one of the great industrial plants of the city in which I was at that time a minister. Violence was threatened. I at once did what I considered to be my duty and interviewed the company officials, who refused to meet a committee of the men or to delay decision on their demands. They courteously gave me to understand that the business was their own, and that they would deal only with individuals and would employ them on their own terms. I then told these employers that I should have to see that the strikers got their case before the public, and that the State Board of Arbitration should be immediately notified. Though unable to secure the use of a hall in any of the public buildings we held a street meeting at which I presented the case

for the men and appealed to every one to allow the Arbitration Board to investigate and settle the matter. A representative committee of the striking men was elected and within four hours the State Board had arranged a meeting between the committee and the officials of the company at which the strike was practically settled. The men have not received all they wanted, or all I believe they deserved, but the workingmen of the town now know, as none of us knew before, what rights a worker has under the laws of the State when he makes an effort to better his condition.

As a minister of the gospel in that community I was given the opportunity, by reason of my activity in this strike, to teach what the gospel of Jesus Christ really means in action, not only to the people of the whole community, but to the people of my church as well. Both the church and the community had to face the application of the gospel to the every-day problems of life. After that incident the general public came to expect that I would act and represent a definite point of view on public affairs, and as a direct consequence, my opportunity to preach and teach the gospel in practical terms was greatly extended.

I am, of course, by no means alone in this kind of pastoral activity. The pioneer work has already been done. Already many men are working out these same convictions in all parts of the country. I well know that there is an increasing number of the young men who are entering the ministry who have this vision of their work, and who are bound to come to the same experiences. Their outlook differs in many respects from that of their elders and from that of many of their teachers. It is my purpose here briefly to set it forth. To do so I shall continue to draw largely from my own experience.

The Tyranny of the System

My mother did not want me to be a minister. But it was not because of the intellectual, social or financial limitations involved. It was because she feared that I would succumb to the peculiar and subtle temptations of the ministry and become like so many ministers whom she had known. How shall I describe them? Perhaps the best way will be by telling some of the things which they did. They were constantly asking for money without having the right spirit toward money themselves, and without having prepared the people to give.

Most of them went out of their way to keep on good terms with the people of means in their parish. Their convictions on all practical affairs outside of the church in the life of the community were pretty sure to coincide with the convictions of the people of wealth in the church. They were against the rural credits system because the banker deacon was against it. They were for the "open shop" because Mr. Honorable Mill Owner, church trustee, was for it. I do not say that they went against their consciences. They didn't investigate the matters enough to have a conscience regarding them. They simply accepted the ideas of their "leading members" as final on all matters in which these "leading members" claimed to be experts. The result was that they worshipped a class God.

The more I see of these men the more I am convinced that most of them are sincere. But they seem to have lost confidence in their ability to accomplish anything vital toward bringing in the Kingdom. Many have no vision of what the Kingdom on earth means. I do not write to condemn these men. Time was when I did, but several years of pastoral work in connection with dominating church officials have made me realize that the difficulty is usually as much due to the tyranny of our church system, which puts the controlling power of the church in the hands of the large contributors, as it is to the character of the minister.

I know many good men who have been coerced by this system. They justify their acquiescence by arguing that it is better to conduct the regular work of the church in peace than it is to disrupt the church by serious difference with leading members. But many of the young men of social vision are entering the ministry today with well considered convictions against such compromise. For my own part, I am one of them, and I have already been made to feel in no uncertain way the results of nonconformity. As assistant pastor of a large city church, my plans for putting the gospel into practice were overruled, not by a frank difference of opinion but by the personal disapproval of a leading member.

My present conviction is that the fundamental thing necessary to enable the minister to do his work is to free him from the power of money. The first step is for the individual minister to free himself from the desire for success as measured in terms of his salary and position. The second step

is to change the present un-Christian system of paying ministers salaries. Why should we not adopt a plan similar to the one which works so well in the mission fields, *i. e.*, that of giving each worker a suitable living for the place where he is stationed, with an extra allowance for children.

The Compelling Task of the Church

Our vision of what must be, however, is to us of much more significance than our criticisms of things as they are. We have faced the so-called limitations and impossibilities of the profession, and the problem of freedom of thought, but we feel that the one big challenge of our day to get action on the principles of the gospel, outweighs them all. Once again my experience may interpret the heart and thought of the group for which I am here speaking

My education was received in the wide open atmosphere of a State university. Here the intellectual setting of my boyhood faith melted away. I had to learn another. I found it in terms of the organic conception of life and of society which is the fine modern fruition of the work which Darwin began. Most of all I found it in the social passion of our day and "in the social awakening in the church," which Harry F. Ward calls "the culmination of evangelical Christianity."¹ Men like Rauschenbusch and Ward are my chosen teachers of religion. Industrial democracy and the cooperative commonwealth are, for me, closely associated with the coming of the Kingdom of God. I feel that without such a program the ideals of the gospel are not tied to concrete activity and tend to vanish in vague emotions and sentiments. The acceptance of the challenge to give my life in working for this program in the spirit of religion, is, I believe, calling out the best that there is in me.

It is with this vision before us that the young ministers for whom I speak repudiate as superficial the current criticisms of the ministry. Our experience has taught us that we can put into effect the principles of the Gospel only in so far as we are willing to pay the price which our Leader freely and willingly paid. We recognize full well that the most stubborn opposition which we must meet is from the ranks of the professing Christians, even as the chief opposition to Jesus was found among the Jews.

¹Ward's "Social Evangelism."

But within our hearts there is a surging faith, born of the experience of being identified with the lives and aspirations of exploited groups of workers, and matured by a careful study of the economic and social forces at work in modern society. Our faith does not know defeat, because it has been built on what the world calls defeat. We know that our text-book, the Bible, is a book of social protest. We are confident that Christians cannot continue to read it without connecting it with the present day literature of social protest against the horrible facts of poverty, industrial injustice and international war. We look to the church for the opportunity to press home these truths upon the great middle classes of America, which make up the membership of the churches and control the destinies of the nation. We do not pretend to fulfil all the formal requirements fastened upon our high calling by precedent but we press on with hot prophetic zeal toward the real goal of the church, which is so well expressed by Ward when he says: "To put the dynamic of God's life into all the activities of men, to bring the social passion to a consciousness of its spiritual nature, to tie the social program to the eternities and fill it with the power of an endless life—this is the compelling task of the church."

A New Kind of Service Flag

Spring Street Presbyterian Church, of New York City, has inaugurated a custom which, we think, is worthy of imitation. In addition to the Service Flag of the usual sort, on Easter Sunday they flew a Christian Service Flag, whereon a small cross stood for each man or woman who had gone into some form of distinctive Christian service at home or abroad.

A Hopeful Plan

Proctor Academy at Andover, New Hampshire, has taken a notable step toward promoting international good will, by organizing a method of correspondence between their own pupils and those of certain schools and colleges in other countries. Two types of letters have been sent out from Proctor Academy and other schools, which have joined in the movement; viz: personal letters and class letters. Personal letters have been sent to pupils in Japan, China and certain South American countries. Class letters have been sent to Argentina through the kindness of the Ambassador, the Hon. R. S. Naón. The work has developed such possibilities that Proctor Academy has created the office of Secretary for the Promotion of International Amity. The first incumbent is Mary N. Chase, who will be glad to answer any inquiries in regard to the plan. She may be addressed at the Academy.

The Library

Religion and the American Democracy

The air is full of schemes of reconstruction of all kinds; after the war all things are to become new, which is very nice and hopeful. But I confess that I am almost reaching the point of boredom with the literature of the subject. What a dreary world it would be if all our reconstructors had their way with it! But my chief complaint against the current discussion is its lightheartedness. The stubborn levity with which this terrific transaction of turning the world upside down is approached by a host of busy, fussy, little minds is truly appalling. If a censorship of schemes of reconstruction could be established in place of the censorship of the press, life would become perceptibly easier for some of us.

The first step in the process of reconstruction is a survey of the foundations; and yet the question whether we want new foundations or whether the old ones are good enough for the new superstructure is hardly ever canvassed. It is lightly assumed that the reconstruction must take place within the cycle of traditional aims; and the primary postulates of sound social architecture are left out of the discussion. What is the use of a new social framework without a new orientation of spirit? How can we envisage a new social order without some idea of what we want it to produce? What profit is it to reorganise social functions if we lack a conception of social ends? And as yet, so far as I know, nobody seems to have carried this discussion into "the realm of ends."

Mr. Stewart Macalister, when he was in charge of Palestine Exploration, made the remark that the only safe assumption on which to proceed in the identification of sacred sites was that none of the traditional identifications was genuine, not even that of Jerusalem. This was, of course, a whimsical hyperbole; but it suggested a necessary precaution for all explorers, and especially for all those busy adventurers into the future who grow daily more numerous. They must set out with a candid scepticism of the validity of all our traditional syntheses and accepted institutions. Their first need is a resolute policy of the open mind. It will not do merely to scrap a few of the more obvious and peripheral anomalies of our social or religious life, atrophied sectarian labels, ancient and discredited economic phrases and the like. There must be a definite and explicit intention to throw the searchlight upon our whole inherited scheme of life.

It is a refreshing breeze of this candor that gives its main interest to a little book which came into my hands a few days ago, "Religion and the New American Democracy," by Joseph Ernest McAfee. Mr. McAfee has not only an open mind but a pleasant and persuasive pen; and once you have started on the book, you have to finish it. In contrast to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s timid excursion into the region of ecclesiastical reconstruction, Mr. McAfee takes a stout broom and sweeps away with a business-like gesture a whole collection of irrelevancies which confuse thought and hamper action. I confess that I greatly fear that he is asking for trouble; he has provided the materials of a first-class heresy-hunt. But he has undoubtedly cleared the ground for action of another and a more hopeful kind.

Mr. McAfee's central idea is that the growing community spirit which has unified the forces of education will presently insist upon subjecting the religious forces to the same process. He rightly inveighs against the criminal multiplication of sectarian places of worship in small communities and the autocratic control of centralised religious machines; and he sees relief from the present chaos only in an attempt on the part of each community to effect a synthesis of the religious elements present in it in a community church. He does not propound this as a scheme; he maintains that it is surely going to happen. And the community church will be comprehensive enough to include not only the multitudinous Protestantism of America but Roman Catholics and Jews. He foresees, of course, that the external variations of religious type must be provided for by some plan of internal differentiation in the community church.

Mr. McAfee is on sound lines in insisting that unity must come by way of comprehension rather than by way of compromise. To gain a basis of unity by agreeing upon the least common denominator leaves only a thin, colorless, emasculated faith. But the more I think of Mr. McAfee's proposal, the more am I staggered by his optimism. There is nothing in which mankind has proved so fissiparous as in religion, and failing some seismic psychological change in the man in the street, I do not see the community church within hail. I wish I did. The present chaos and waste is scandalous and intolerable; and to pursue a blind policy of "laissez faire" will only make confusion worse confounded. No serious mind can accept such a responsibility.

My feeling is that Mr. McAfee will have to start his argument at a deeper level. He quotes a definition of religion from "one of our ablest thinkers" as "a consciousness of the higher social values." But he must surely see that this will not do. A consciousness of the higher social values is not religion but one of its products. Religion is essentially a relation, more or less conscious, more or less articulate, to an ultimate reality. You may call this ultimate reality God or Allah or x ; but the sense that it is there and that we have in some way or other to do with it, is religion. But the character of a religion, its distinctive exercises, its ethical reactions, its sense of social values depend upon the particular moral quality it associates with its ultimate reality. Religious differences are not after all mere surface variations; they enter into the very texture of life. When a Mohammedan prays to Allah and Mr. McAfee prays to God, *they simply do not mean the same thing*, and I cannot conceive of a community church expansive enough to include them both. And even within the Christian fold, there are incompatibilities, almost as profound, as, for instance, between Mr. McAfee and Billy Sunday. There is among us already a charity which should enable us to live together in peace; but we have not reached that plane of charity on which we can call upon God in unison, or which can obscure the fact that many of us are—however sincerely—working for irreconcilable ends.

I do not see how we can approach the problem at all fruitfully without in the first instance limiting its frontiers with some severity. A community Protestant Church would be a great achievement in itself,—a considerable step in the way and it is

not impracticable, I think. But the first step toward this achievement is to face a few questions. What is the end of the church? What is it here for? Is it merely a focus for the religious interests and exercises of a society of people who conceive of God in the same general way? Has it any propagandist duties? If so, what are they? Within what limits and under what conditions are they to be exercised? Is proselytism to be barred out? If so, what then becomes of the New Testament? And if the New Testament is not to be accepted as normative, how are we to define the nature and the uses of a Christian society?

Perhaps I am not yet emancipated from the dead hand; but I find myself more convinced than ever that it is impossible to think out the meaning of religion rightly except over against the background of the moral tragedy of the world. Our task, whether as churchmen or sociologists, is to solve the problem of overcoming that radical egoism in human nature which is sometimes called sin and which, whatever you call it, is the spring of all our social confusions, the energy of disintegration which leads to war and to all the age-long schemes which rend the race. And despite all that Mr. McAfee says of the spiritual elements involved in this war, we are confronted with the most colossal relapse into barbarism that civilized history records. Not all our culture and education, not all the alleged forces of evolution have availed to prevent it; and I confess I see no hope for the world unless for this radical evil there is a no less radical remedy. The community church is a remedy for a great deal of scandalous confusion and waste, for the absence of charity and mutual understanding; but for the ultimate moral disorder which lies behind all this and of much more and much worse, there seems to be nothing adequate except that process of personal revolution which—when all is said and done—is the distinctive note of the New Testament.

If Christianity were a cultus, then the sooner the better it were merged in the rest of its kind. But it is not a cultus but a Gospel; and when it loses that character, it becomes something else. I am not concerned about a label,—not even that of Christian; but the essentially revolutionary impact of the good news must, it seems to me, be preserved at all costs. Our hope of the new world stands or falls with it. And this raises one more of my misgivings, and that is the persistency of the word *American* in Mr. McAfee's discussion. Virtually he is on the way to a new "national" church. I know that many think it to be the glory of the Reformation that it produced "national" churches; but the Christian consciousness is specifically super-national. Nationality moreover is not a permanent principle in the world's affairs; it is a comparatively modern phenomenon, and its history shows that it is only a stage in the development of mankind as it passes on from the stage of tribalism to a citizenship wide as the world. The Christian outlook is towards "the great society," in which (if the New Testament is to be trusted,) there is neither Greek nor Jew, neither American nor Chinaman. And if religion be expressed in "a consciousness of the higher social values," it is entirely certain that in the Christian scheme these higher social values are determined by the vision of a human unity which transcends our Americanism and our Britannicism and our Gallicism and all the rest.

I have wandered on, rather at random; and I could say a good deal more. That, however, is the best compliment I could pay

to Mr. McAfee. His little book "gives furiously to think," and I suppose that is what he chiefly intended it to do. Meantime, I want to say that all this that I have written is not meant for criticism. It is only the record of a few reactions to an extraordinarily stimulating discussion.

RICHARD ROBERTS.

Tracts for the Times

The most extensive and important pamphlet literature we have seen lately is a series of little publications issued by The National Civil Liberties Bureau, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York. The whole series may be procured for thirty cents. These publications seek to propagate no particular doctrine or social theory but rather to express the profound faith of John Milton that "Truth is strong next to the Almighty; she needs no policies nor strategies nor licensing to make her victorious." Their editors agree to the full with President's Wilson's declaration, "I conceive it to be one of the needs of the hour to restore the processes of common counsel." The first step is to present the facts, and this is done in a series of pamphlets dealing with certain recent notable cases of attacks upon freedom by judicial decision or mob violence. Perhaps the most striking and significant of this series is the account of the "Knights of Liberty Mob and the I. W. W. prisoners at Tulsa, Okla." If one reads in connection with this pamphlet the very careful statement of "The Truth About the I. W. W." (in the same series) prepared by John Fitch, George P. West and Roger Baldwin, he will have an understanding of a vital problem not to be found in the most profound study of the headlines or editorials of the daily press.

At a time when the usual voices of public opinion are silent through ignorance, selfishness, or fear, such publications as these are indispensable in preserving the right of opinion which includes, as Mr. Norman Angell well says, "the right of the heretic to his heresy" as the only basis for establishing a free and happy society.

N. T.

Who's Who Among our Contributors

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER is minister of the Broadway Congregational Church of Somerville, Massachusetts.
HENRY J. CADBURY is professor of Biblical Literature at Haverford College, Pennsylvania.
RICHARD ROBERTS is minister of the Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn, New York; he was formerly a Presbyterian minister in London.
CHARLES A. ELLWOOD is professor of Sociology at the University of Missouri; he is the author of "An Introduction to Social Psychology" (Appleton) and other notable sociological studies.

The New World

is published by The Fellowship Press, Incorporated (at 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.), established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued, not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

The Fellowship Press, Inc.: Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.
Editorial Board of *The New World*: Norman M. Thomas, Managing Editor; Edward W. Evans, Harold A. Hatch, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Richard Roberts, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward, and Walter G. Fuller, Secretary.

Contributions to *The New World* should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope if reply is desired.

The New World is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy, annual subscription one dollar. Orders for copies, subscriptions and all correspondence should be sent to *The New World* at the Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

The Public is the great Non-partisan Liberal Interpreter. It interprets for its readers the developments of the day in Washington and in the European centers, where history is being made—and always with relation to their bearing on democracy. Its editorial staff is intent on getting the facts and presenting them in their true significance.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION
26 WEEKS, ONLY \$1

THE PUBLIC, 122 E. 37th St., N. Y.

THE NEW WORLD

is now on sale in

New York City at
Brentano's, Fifth Ave. & 27th St.
Rand School Book-store, 7 East 15th Street

Boston at
The Old Corner Book-store, 27 Bromfield Street

Messages For The Times

Published by the Free Religious Association

By John Haynes Holmes

President of the Association

"THE INTERNATIONAL MIND"

"WHO'S WHO IN 'BILLY' SUNDAY'S HELL"

"WHAT SHALL WE THINK ABOUT JESUS?"

By George W. Nasmyth

"WORLD UNITY AND WORLD RELIGION"

By Frank C. Doan

"THE OUTSIDE OF THE CHURCH"

Membership in the F. R. A., including "UNITY," official organ, published weekly in Chicago, and all other publications for year, Two Dollars.

The Association Emphasizes Scientific Religion, Industrial Democracy and World Unity as the Three Supreme Religious Issues of our time.

We ask your co-operation.

FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION of AMERICA

GEORGE GROVER MILLS, General Secretary

WALKER BUILDING

120 BOYLSTON STREET, BOSTON

American Liberties in War Time

The National Civil Liberties Bureau is publishing the facts in a series of pamphlets. A full set will be sent on receipt of 30c., single copies 3c.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

THE ISSUES

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Why Freedom Matters, by Norman Angell. | Constitutional Rights in War-time (legal). |
| Liberty in Wartime (the situation in the United States in view of English experience), by Alice Edgerton. | Freedom of Speech and of the Press (extracts from the writings of statesmen and scholars). |
| Who are the Traitors? (leaflet). | |

CASES

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The Outrage on Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow of Cincinnati (October 28, 1917). | The Case of the Christian Pacifists at Los Angeles, by Norman M. Thomas. |
| The "Knights of Liberty" Mob and the I. W. W. Prisoners at Tulsa, Okla. (November 9, 1917). | The Truth About the I. W. W. (facts in relation to the present trial). |
| | The Conviction of Kate Richards O'Hare, and North Dakota Politics. |

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| War's Heretics; a plea for a fair understanding of Conscientious Objection, by Norman M. Thomas. | The Facts about the Conscientious Objector in the United States. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|

NOTE: These pamphlets deal solely with the protection of American liberties in wartime. They are not colored by any "ism" or propaganda

Cut this out and mail to

NATIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES BUREAU,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Send { full set
those checked } to

Name.....

Address.....

With the hot sun beating down on their frail underfed bodies—with no hope of relief in sight—the little children and tired mothers of the slums are facing another grim summer in their empty lives.

Help Us Give These Unfortunates A Chance for Health

Sea Breeze—the Association's fresh air home—gives the one chance for rest, nourishment and care for many of these families each year—but help is needed at once if we are to provide for the long waiting list.

Will you give—just a little? Allow 60 cents a day or \$4.00 a week for each one whom you will send as your guest.

The New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor
105 East 22nd Street
Room 250 New York

Please

George
Hagden,
A. I. C. P.,
105 E. 22d St.,
New York

Enclosed is \$.....
with which you are
to give fresh air relief
to the most needy cases.

Name.....
Address.....

With the promptness of journalism—

With the insight and sure-footedness of economic research—

With the graphic quality of social exhibits—

THE SURVEY interprets the social background of the week's news. The SURVEY was the first American journal to bring out the real significance of the British labor offensive. Editorials in the liberal Manchester *Guardian* and the conservative London *Times* bear out Paul U. Kellogg's estimates of the movement of the English workers as a force for endurance and coherence as well as for democracy in the present crisis. Here is the greatest and freest organized movement in Europe today supporting the principles which America stands for and which President Wilson has enunciated—the principles which, in the words of an English newspaper man, were worth "twelve army corps and a regiment of angels" to the forces for democracy in western Europe.

The Huts

By Arthur Gleason

OF THE AMERICAN Y. M. C. A. IN FRANCE

GLEASON has known the war from the outset, when he was a stretcher-bearer in Belgium—the only American quoted by the Bryce commission on Belgian atrocities. He knows the work and the workers under the Red Triangle of the English Y. M. C. A. He knows American social work as an investigator and journalist. He knows the Y. M. C. A. in France with an authenticity, an intimate acquaintance with every part of the field, and a discrimination which will make his article a constructive contribution to American effort and understanding. Mr. Gleason was in a vessel torpedoed off the coast of Ireland in midwinter. He lost everything—socks and manuscripts included. But he has set out again, bringing this story with him.

Twice Devastated

By Mary Ross

OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

BATTERIES of camions, loaded with blankets, clothing, food and medicine, were made ready in Paris as early as January by the American Red Cross to rush to the source of any fresh stream of refugees. Warehouses, district agents, canteens, relief workers, were waiting to serve the old, the feeble, the sick, and the children, now once again dispossessed by the great German drive. A story, with photographs, of the "twice refugees" is on the way to the SURVEY in response to a cable. The author is a member of the headquarters staff of the Civil Affairs Department of the American Red Cross.

The War-Folk of Picardy

By Mary Masters Needham

OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR DEVASTATED FRANCE

WHAT has happened to the sinisters—the people left behind in the "liberated area" when the Germans fell back last spring? And to the emigrés—those who came back? What of the American agencies that worked with them—the Quakers, the Smith College Unit, the American Fund for French Wounded (the American Committee for Devastated France), the American Red Cross and the rest? Mrs. Needham returned recently from Blerancourt, near the great battleground of the western front, and tells from first-hand experience.

Two More Articles on the British Labor Movement

By Paul U. Kellogg

EDITOR OF THE SURVEY

THE ENGLAND THEY ARE FIGHTING FOR.—An Interpretation of the Domestic Program of the English Labour Party.—The Labour Party has stretched its tent-ropes to include workers "with brains" as well as "with hand." It will run candidates in a hundred, two hundred constituencies, perhaps more, under the leadership of Arthur Henderson. The cooperative movement has entered politics and made common cause with the labour party.

WORKERS CONTROL.—The New Movement for Self-government in English Industry.—Who are the shop stewards and why? The revolution in industrial organization promoted by the government in line with the Whitley commission. The Guild Socialists. The women workers. Programs of far-sighted employers and the activity of the new Ministry of Reconstruction.

Survey
Associates, Inc.
115 East 19th St.
New York

Enclosed is a dollar
bill. Send me a five
months' trial subscription
beginning now.

Name

Address

.....

THESE ARTICLES will be published in early issues of the SURVEY. A dollar will get them as parts of a *five months' trial subscription*. Join the SURVEY, help us make every issue strong in such first-hand material, distinctive in that social insight which makes the SURVEY what it is—an adventure in cooperative journalism in which the social workers of America share with each other the things which make up the life and labor of the times.

SURVEY ASSOCIATES, Inc., 115 E. 19th St., New York

NOT RECORDED
"THE CHARACTERISTIC DEMAND OF CHRISTIANITY IS FOR A NEW WORLD."—G. K. Chesterton

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. I. No. 6

JUNE, 1918

10 Cents

*"The New World" appears this month under the title "The World Tomorrow."
An explanation of the change will be found on the first page of this issue.*

"My Dear Stevenson—"

Norman Thomas

Military Training in the Making of Men

Frederick J. Libby

Finland's Tragic Struggle

Santeri Nuorteva

Industrial Democracy at Work in Britain

Harry W. Laidler

Signs of the Times

The Lull in the Storm—Why Not an Allied Peace Offensive?—The Lichnowsky Memorandum—Ireland and the Allied Cause—Mr. Gompers Isolates American Labor—Watching the Basket—Even Handed Justice in Arizona—Dollars for Lives

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street

New York, New York

Digitized by Google

THE MAGNA CHARTA OF THE NEW DEMOCRACY

IT is one of the tritest commonplaces today to speak of the world before the war as a world that has passed forever. Mankind will never return to the old social and economic arrangements; yet with what are these to be replaced? The civilization of yesterday is shattered and obsolete; what is to be the framework of the civilization of tomorrow? Almost alone among political or other organizations, the British Labor Party has set itself, systematically and fearlessly, to answer these imperative questions. The result, as embodied in its recent Report on Reconstruction, is everywhere recognized as marking an epoch in social history. In its animating spirit, as well as in most of its specific details, it is of world significance, scarcely less applicable to American than to British conditions. In order that this inspiring and revolutionary document may have the widest possible publicity in this country, it has been published in a handsomely printed pamphlet of 44 pages entitled **TOWARDS A NEW WORLD**, containing besides the complete text of the Report a notable article on "Rebuilding the Social Order" by Arthur Henderson, leader of the British Labor Party, and the Manifesto to the Labor Movement by the English Fellowship of Reconciliation, which admirably supplements on the spiritual side the practical programme of the labor movement. Every reader of "The World To-morrow" should send today for a copy of **TOWARDS A NEW WORLD**, and possess in permanent form the most epoch-making programme of social reconstruction ever formulated.

"A very remarkable thing is happening in America. Liberals and radicals of all shades and degrees of opinion are finding a common ground and, and see before them a common road leading to that new social order of which we have dreamed and toward which we have striven so long without hope of arriving at our destination in this generation or the next. That common ground is the program of the British Labor Party. It has electrified liberal America as the speeches of President Wilson have electrified liberal Europe. And if liberal Europe looks to Wilson today as a Moses, we in turn look to the British Labor Party's program as the Ten Commandments. Not the strength of them is that they are not commandments, nor dogmas, nor final things, but a successful attempt to strike at the roots without attempting the impossible, and to be constructive without being trivial and merely ameliorative. It is that thing for which we have waited so long,—a program practicable enough for today and tomorrow, yet radical enough to bring our ultimate destination within view."

THE PUBLIC.

"Probably the most mature and carefully formulated program ever put forth by a responsible political party. It is the result of an exhaustive criticism of the whole English experience in social legislation during the past four generations. It is worthy of consideration in this country no less general and serious than that which it will receive in Great Britain."

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

"The British Labor Party's report on Reconstruction is obviously the work of economic thinkers of rare vision and ability, and it may well rank among historical documents of the highest class. . . . It is impossible not to feel that we are here dealing with a new thing in the literature of politics; and we believe that the future historian will put his finger upon this paper as the point at which a new idea of the first magnitude made effectual entrance into political theory and practice. . . . In this report, British labor appears to assume definite leadership in the creation of the political and economic framework of the new world."

THE WORLD TOMORROW.

"The recent Report on Reconstruction issued by the British Labor Party is the most comprehensive scheme of economic change yet formulated by a responsible political party. Of even greater significance than the practical details of the program is its spirit. . . . We are here face to face with a new type of political philosophy, a type which rests upon a definite view of the ends of life and a vision of life as a whole. The historical significance of this document appears to be that it presages a new stage in the development of the democratic ideal. Perhaps it is the beginning of the long-delayed economic sequel of the achievement of the French Revolution, in which case it may very well turn out to be the Magna Charta of the new democracy."

THE NATION.

*Sent postpaid anywhere for
20 cents (stamps or silver)*

W. R. BRGWNE, BOX 305, WYOMING, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. I. No. 7

JULY, 1918

10 Cents

The European Scene

IT would require the inspired intuition of a Daniel to thread a rational way through this tangle which Europe presents at the present moment. From one end to another, it seems to be a hopeless maze of conflicting motives and movements; and he would be a wise prophet indeed who could foresee with tolerable accuracy the situation which is likely to crystallize out of the existing welter. The theatre is so vast that a single intelligence can hardly grasp it as a whole; and the inner life of at least three of the great European nations is so effectually hidden that we can form nothing but the vaguest conjecture concerning what is going on in them. Yet out of this extraordinary chaos we must somehow extract the materials of a concrete policy if we are not to go on blindly spending blood and treasure upon a labor of Sisypheus.

It is true that President Wilson has proposed certain general principles for the ordering of international affairs in the future; and there is a general consent (except for a few incorrigible reactionaries) that a serious and sustained endeavor must be made to organize the world upon the basis of these principles. But the question still remains—how are these principles to be translated into a coherent and effectual policy for the days immediately following the war? In that interim during which we are constructing the new world machinery, what are we to do with the multitudinous local problems of Europe, and in particular, how are we to approach them in a spirit and a way which shall be consistent with the fabric of those better world relations toward which we are eagerly looking?

The other day there appeared in the press a note to the effect that peace negotiations were in progress between Turkey and the new Republic of the

Trans-Caucasus. But how many of those who read the note could give even the most general account of what has been happening on the Turco-Russian borderland during the last twelve months or of the problems involved in the relations of Georgians, Armenians, Tartars, the mountaineers and the rest of the heterogeneous humanity which inhabits the tract of country that lies between the Black and the Caspian Seas? Now that the old imperialistic bond has been shattered, the hereditary racial jealousies of the peoples of that region may present the world with a problem that might easily out-balkan the Balkans. This is a single instance of the vast and complex tasks that we shall be confronted with before many months are past. Have we the knowledge, the understanding, the insight and the breadth of vision that are needful for this almost inconceivable enterprise?

The Three Essential Conditions

What is happening now in relation to Russia illustrates the enormous possibility of miscarriage which is latent in the European situation after the war. Elsewhere in this issue we have commented briefly on certain aspects of this situation. Here we desire to urge that there are three conditions absolutely essential to the formulation of a sound and fruitful policy, whether in Russia or elsewhere. The first is a broad historical background which shall give us a sense of proportion; the second is a knowledge of facts as they are, in their bare *net* truth; the third is a spirit of disinterestedness. Having all these things, we then need to ask ourselves—How is Russia to be helped so that its immense religious and economic possibilities may be brought to render common service to the new world of political and social democracy to which we have pledged ourselves? This is a very much

arger question than that of bringing Russia back into the war or of even restoring the Constituent Assembly or any of the other partial aims which are from time to time advocated as the one thing needful.

In Russia, the canons of the traditional political method are no longer applicable; we are faced with the task of evolving and applying a bold and realistic moral policy to our relations with Russia if we are not to be compelled later or to undo at infinite cost what we now do in our haste. The Russian situation is so unprecedented that we can hardly be blamed for having no policy ready to apply to it; but we cannot be found blameless if we remain much longer in this attitude of expecting a solution to drop from the skies. And if while we tarry the policy of military intervention prevails because we failed to propound an alternative, we must share the responsibility for the consequences. Meantime, it appears to us that the path of reason leads first to a formal acknowledgment of the Soviet organization as the *de facto* government of Russia and then to the appointment of a representative and disinterested economic commission charged with the business of helping to restore and to stabilize the internal circulation of Russian life. Any other way threatens confusion worse confounded.

But vast and difficult as the problem of Russia is, it is comparatively simple by the side of the situation which Europe as a whole will present when the war ends. From Finland, with its own bitter domestic schism, to Albania and the Dodecanese, there are actions and reactions, hopes and desires, projects and counterprojects, bewildering in their variety and their variability. Our paralysis in the face of the Russian crisis should prove a salutary warning against a like tragical unreadiness when we come to face the European situation as a whole. Naturally public interest is at the moment focussed upon matters immediately affecting the course of the war; but behind the reported story of military operations there is an unreported ferment in all the belligerent nations which is destined to have a profound influence upon the making of peace and upon the history of the years following. Europe is heaving and panting with popular movements of which only faint and partial echoes appear to cross the Atlantic; and it would be a very foolish statemanship which did not see

is phenomenon the chief factor in Europe

during the next generation. Terms of peace which do not take it into account are destined to become obsolete within a decade.

The New Internationalism of Labor

This ferment may be looked at in two ways. In the larger European countries it is chiefly economic in character and is connected with the proletarian movement, which already has the Russian Revolution to its credit. In England it has articulated itself in the new Labor Party; and both in France and Italy it is becoming increasingly powerful and vocal. Its most distinctive quality is its internationalism. To labor leaders who have not emerged from the elementary stage of national particularism, the international character of the European labor movement is an unintelligible and sinister fact; it bewilders them and makes them angry. But they will have to reconcile themselves to it, for it has come to stay. Leaders who have been outstripped by the movement they profess to lead are, however, not the only people who fear this new phenomenon. As these lines are written, the newspapers report that Troelstra, the Dutch Socialist leader, who was to attend the Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor meeting in London is not to be allowed to land in England, apparently because he had interviewed Philip Scheidemann, the German Socialist, before sailing. This is evidently the same policy as that which forbade the issue of passports to Margaret Bondfield and Fred Shaw, the British Trade Union Congress delegates to the American Federation of Labor Convention. In much the same spirit the German Government has, according to Branting, the Swedish Socialist leader, effectually prevented the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist declaration of war aims from entering Germany. Traditional statecraft is plainly keeping true to its ancient habit of strengthening movements it does not like by trying to starve them to death. In any case, we have the clearest possible evidence of the growth of a proletarian internationalism in Europe; and, to belittle its power, as the American Labor delegation newly returned from Europe is apparently doing, is simply to throw dust into the eyes of the public. The virtual renunciation of the imperialistic accretions to the original war aims of the Allies (revealed by the Russian publication of the secret treaties), especially those of the Franco-Russian agreement and of the Italian Treaty,

directly proves the influence of the European labor movement. And this is still the day of small things.

The New Nationalism

The second aspect of the unrest of Europe appears at first to be in sharp contrast to the internationalism of labor; for it is essentially particularist in aim. The Irish crisis is no isolated affair even within the British Isles. On May 21 a Welsh National Conference inaugurated a campaign for federal autonomy for Wales. The break-up of the Russian Empire has partially liberated a company of small nations, the existence of which had almost been forgotten by the world. Courland, Lithuania, Livonia, Esthonia, the Ukraine, the Tartars, the Georgians and other races of the Caucasus country are all alike proposing to set up house for themselves as soon as possible; and there can be little doubt that once the German flood in the East recedes, these peoples will not only demand but receive recognition as independent political entities. The Italo-Jugo Slav agreement reveals the existence within Austria of centrifugal movements of considerable strength. Serbs, Croats, Slovenes in the south, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks and Roumainians in the north, are united in the desire to be liberated from the rule of the Hapsburgs. Even within Belgium, the Germans have taken advantage of the traditional mutual jealousy of the Flemings and the Walloons to divide the country into two administrative districts; with the evident hope that the Flemish people will insist upon the recognition of their separate nationality after the war.

It would, however, be a profound mistake to suppose that the new labor internationalism and the new national particularism are antagonistic and mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they are really complementary. For there can be no genuine internationalism except upon the basis of national freedom. That the world can ever go back to an exclusive national particularism is unthinkable; but we have learned enough to know that there is no abiding unity for men in great imperial aggregations of peoples. For imperialism we must substitute the ideal of federation; but federalism implies the freedom of the uniting groups. That is why "National Self-determination" is so essential to the future health and wealth of the world; and the Peace Conference ought to establish the principle that every reason-

ably defined national group should be free to choose its own destiny if it wants to do so; yes, and not only to establish the principle but to enforce it with courage and consistency, in the certain knowledge that by so doing it is laying the only possible foundation for a peaceful and wholesome order in the world. The "imperialistic" stage of history is at an end; henceforth free peoples will federate into larger cooperative unities; and it is no idle dream that sees in this development the promise of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

The Impulse to Federation

The impulse to federation is already here; that is indeed the significance of labor internationalism. It is the necessary foundation for the liberty and independence of nations. So far from this liberty and independence becoming the occasion of future war, it now becomes the opportunity of the new growing international spirit of the common folk of Europe. Of course the vested interests and other reactionary elements of European society will oppose these new popular tendencies; and it is evident that they are preparing to do so in some earnest. The German Government is circulating the pro-British memorandum of former Ambassador Lichnowsky at thirty pfennig a copy. Is it possible they are actually endeavoring to pave the way for ultimate friendly relations with Britain—the only considerable European power that they conceive might be interested in preserving the dynastic tradition? But dynasties have gone out of fashion for good, and all monarchies are held only on short leases, as we suspect the numerous tribe of German princes are soon to discover along with the rest.

The present political situation presents a strange paradox: on the surface never were governments more powerful or their sway over individuals more absolute. But look closer. Austria-Hungary is apparently on the verge of dissolution; the volume of political criticism steadily increases in Germany and there are competent observers who believe that unless there is a decisive military victory before winter the days of Hohenzollern dynasty will be few and full of trouble. In Great Britain the ignominious retreat of the powerful Lloyd George war cabinet on Irish conscription and Home Rule shows how precarious is the power of government in the face of organized and intelligent

resistance. To hold the Sinn Feiners without trial is a proof not of strength but of fear, as is openly acknowledged by the English press,—and in all countries the arrest of individual heretics, and the hatred of all officialdom for movements towards internationalism find their explanation largely in a psychology of governmental terror. Men are slaves of their own ideas and freedom will come when they realize that the competition of the “Great Powers,” each of them absolute in its own boundaries, has made for war and oppression, not for peace and freedom.

The reactionaries are doomed to ultimate defeat. Neither open resistance nor covert intrigue can long arrest the rising current of freedom and internationalism. It lies now within the power of men to bring it about that this generation shall not pass away until it sees the foundations of the United States of Europe well and truly laid—the newly emancipated lesser nations, in the exercise of their freedom, entering into the mutual bonds of a federated life. By some such way as this—the free synthesis of free peoples—we shall at last gain the universal city of man; and not otherwise.

Signs of the Times—an Editorial Survey

Germany's Pyrrhic Victories

Again the German drive in France has come to a halt without attaining an objective commensurate with its losses, and as we write the Austrian offensive against Italy seems likely to be even less effective. It would be foolish, however, to believe that the enemy effort is ended. His military position and internal political conditions alike compel him to renew the struggle. The history of the last few days proves him devoid neither of military skill nor strength; and if Americans are confident of victory, it is because of increasing trust in General Foch's leadership, the bravery of his forces (including ever increasing numbers of Americans), and the belief that time is working for the Allies.

Meanwhile the recent U-boat raid on our eastern seaboard has been spectacular and measurably successful in the destruction of shipping. It has of course neither frightened our Government into the withdrawal of our naval forces from European waters, nor checked the remarkably rapid shipment of troops, nor in any way weakened the national morale, rather the reverse. All in all, despite certain real achievements which it would be foolish to deny, these must be disillusionizing days for the German high command. A dictated military peace is clearly beyond its grasp.

Chaos in Central Europe

It is becoming clear that the success of our war aims depends as much upon our ranging a comprehensive and intelligent program of ideas against Germany's *Mittel Europa* scheme as upon our military strength on the western front. But the laying down of such a program is a large order. The whole situation is extraordinarily baffling. The nationalistic ambitions of the Czecho Slovak and Jugo (or Southern) Slavic groups are growing stronger day by day. They have evoked favorable recognition from Secretary Lansing and leading Allied statesmen. Yet this situation makes less immediately to the advantage of the Allied cause than might at first sight seem probable. If in Austria-Hungary, as in Russia, the discontent were pri-

marily economic and unified, we might expect a general revolution—at no distant date—but because discontent among the working classes and peasants of Hungary and of Austria proper is primarily economic, and among the Slavic groups primarily nationalistic, a bankrupt government with powerful German backing still holds its own by the ancient principle “divide and govern.” In the crucible of war some fusion of these discordant elements may be effected sooner than we think. No man can prophesy, but every man can desire that the day of deliverance of all oppressed peoples may be near at hand.

Is Nationalism the Way Out?

Professor Masaryk, leader of the Czecho Slovak group, is now in America, where his own high character and sober statement of facts give weight to his plea for Bohemian independence. In his view, justice demands the erection of a belt of comparatively small free nations between Germany and Russia from the Arctic down through to the Balkan Peninsula—some seventeen in all. To the question how these nations could exist and prosper he has suggested two answers: (1) The analogy of Switzerland, and (2), the idea of a sort of Federation between them. Much as we sympathize with Prof. Masaryk's ideals, his answer on this point is scarcely convincing. Historical, geographical and economic conditions through the belt he is proposing to set free are totally different from those that have made Switzerland possible. They resemble rather the conditions which have cursed the Balkan peninsula. Most of these new states would have large minority racial groups; in Bohemia, for instance, one-third of the population would be irreconcilably Teutonic. Every state would be an Ireland with an Ulster problem of its own. In the Baltic states it is already plain that the middle class would be pro-German, and the proletariat pro-Russian. Economic interests would pull all the smaller nations far more toward Germany or toward a rejuvenated Russia than common fear of Prussianism would unite them with one another.

What, then, shall we do? The present situation in Austria-Hungary and throughout Central Europe is intolerable to large

sections of the population. A Prussianized *Mittel Europa* would be a menace to the world's peace. On the other hand Prof. Masaryk's plan seems to present insuperable difficulties. Does not our only hope lie not in more nationalism but in less, in a frank trust in internationalism embodied in a League of Nations? In other words, is not the *primary* condition of peace the creation of a new principle in the relation between all states rather than the creation of new independent states? Under a League of Nations the self-determination of peoples would find guarantees quite impossible in any nationalistic program. Indeed, the League of Nations requires for real strength and moral validity the freest scope for the principle of self-determination. Nevertheless, it can rest only on a cultivation of a sense of internationalism, a community of interests, and a love of mankind transcending state lines, as our love for America transcends our state and sectional loyalties.

Some recognition of this fact is stirring in Europe and is the inspiration of such diverse movements as the Bolshevik appeal to working-class solidarity, the Allied socialist proposals for an interbelligerent labor conference, and the call of the Scandinavian churches for Christians of all nations to meet together in prayer. But the new day has not yet broken in our western hemisphere. Our reactionary press has only ridicule for the Bolshevik appeal, Samuel Gompers's labor delegates can't even speak politely to British and French radicals (*vide* Professor Lovejoy's admission on this point in *The New Republic*), and the Federal Council of Churches takes no action on the Scandinavian proposal, attempting to justify its failure by no better excuse than the hoary phrase "not at this time." Do we really think our lip devotion to a League of Nations is honored by a narrow nationalistic policy in trade, in diplomacy and in religion?

Hands Off Russia

Everybody is saying that "something must be done about Russia"—but few can agree what that something ought to be. The advocates of intervention by the Allies, either with or without the assistance of the United States, have redoubled their energies within the last few weeks without troubling themselves to answer any of the solid objections to their plan, practical as well as moral. As an alternative to intervention various commissions are proposed. In the confusion of voices one thing unites most of our press: the Soviet Government must go. In the minds of nearly all the writers of editorials Prussianism is a chastising by whips, but Bolshevism is a chastising by scorpions.

One notable feature of the press campaign against the Soviet Government is that it is quite evidently organized. It is, of course, in part the natural expression of uncompromising capitalistic opposition to a socialist republic. We hear that the heavy cost of this campaign is partly met by "expense" money held out of loans made by the United States to the former Russian Government. These loans are now being administered by Mr. Bakmetieff, who was appointed Russian Ambassador at Washington in the early days of the Revolution, and has since been repudiated by the Soviet Government. The campaign makes its popular appeal mainly to the general feeling of anger at the treaty of Brest-Litovsk (a reverse which must be ascribed in part to the failure of Allied help, moral no less than military),

and to the general resentment at the confusion and brutalities reported under Soviet rule.

Under these circumstances the great mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, New York City, on June 11th, convened at short notice by the newly formed Russian Soviet Recognition League (whose headquarters are at 299 Broadway, New York City), had real significance. The enthusiasm and passion and unanimity of that vast audience of ten thousand people proved that the great mass of Russians, Finns, Esthonians and Ukrainians within our gates are resolutely opposed to any form of intervention and are at one in demanding immediate recognition of the Soviet Government.

A notable opponent of intervention appeared at this meeting in Professor Lomonossov, who was appointed head of the Russian Railway Mission in this country by the Provisional Government before even Kerensky rose to power. While out of sympathy with Bolshevik theories and practice, he strongly urges recognition by the United States. Briefly his argument is that the Soviet Government represents the wishes of ninety per cent of the people.

"Power in Russia," says Professor Lomonossov, "rests not in the Bolsheviki as much as in the Soviets (councils of peasants and working-men). Today the majority may be of the Bolsheviki. Tomorrow it may be of the social revolutionists or even of the 'black hundreds.'"

The Soviets have made many mistakes, but it is no use crying over spilt milk. They are learning all the time and are plainly becoming more cautious. The only sensible course for America is to allay suspicion by recognizing the Russian Government and then to aid it by every honorable means in our power. This general position (despite newspaper reports to the contrary) has the approval of the few Americans who best know what they are talking about when they speak of Russia, however widely they may differ in their political philosophy.

Let us try to see this thing in its right proportions. The Russian Revolution is one of the great events of all time. As the Protestant Reformation brought religious freedom, as the French Revolution brought political freedom, so this great upheaval of our own day may secure economic freedom for mankind. Much of what is happening in Russia today is far from beautiful (the Reformation and the French Revolution had their own terrible excesses), yet we who profess to believe in democracy and in self-determination of peoples will interfere with Russia at our peril. President Wilson has rendered no greater service than in restraining Allied intervention and in recognizing the idealism beneath the turmoil of revolution. It seems to us that the next step logically in his policy is recognition of the *de facto* Soviet Government and the extension of aid material and moral by the best equipped men at our disposal.

If this program is distasteful to our Bourbons they should pause to think for a moment. We gravely fear that its alternative, however, well-intentioned some interventionists may be, is a peculiarly subtle and mischievous piece of pro-Germanism. After Brest-Litovsk Germany cannot *win* Russia; but by an ill-advised policy at this time we may *drive* her into acceptance of German economic penetration.

Open Diplomacy—But “This Is No Time”

In his famous address to Congress in January, President Wilson laid down as the first of his cardinal principles for a world made safe for democracy, “open covenants of peace, *openly arrived at*, after which there shall be no private international understanding of any kind; but diplomacy shall proceed *always frankly and in the public view*.” In June, he writes to Mr. Lansing, apropos of Senator Borah’s resolution for public discussion of international treaties in the Senate, “I take it for granted that you feel as I do that this is no time to act as the resolution prescribes, and certainly when I pronounced for open diplomacy, *I meant, not that there should be no private discussion of delicate matters*, but that no secret agreements of any sort should be entered into, and that all international relations *when fixed* should be open, aboveboard and explicit.” (The italics are ours throughout.)

We can only believe that the multitude of his cares leads the President to deal with this fundamental question of open diplomacy in such summary fashion, and in a spirit apparently so different from that which inspired his former utterance. For if diplomacy proceeding, “always frankly and in the public view,” means merely the publication of international agreements *already fixed*, words have lost their ordinary values; and like so many other great political and religious creeds the President’s historic address on peace terms will be subjected to a process of contradictory interpretation which will leave the famous fourteen points as vital to the great settlement as are the Thirty-Nine Articles, or as binding on the governments as the German guarantee of Belgian neutrality. We may permit ourselves to ask whether the President really intends so complete a change of front. If so, what is the reason for the change?—and what does it portend?

In this connection it is worth while to examine present day American diplomatic procedure. International agreements to which America is a party are of two sorts: (1) Formal treaties which require ratification by the Senate, which, however, has discussed them in executive—a euphemism for secret-session. They are then frankly published. (2) “Executive agreements” between governments not ratified by the Senate, which often have all the force of treaties. The latest example is the so-called Lansing-Ishii pact, governing certain important points in our relations with Japan. We had thought it had always been the American custom to make these agreements public (in distinction from the secret agreements of certain European countries), so that for America the President’s present definition of open diplomacy implies no advance in policy.

It is, of course, vitally important that a nation should know all there is to know about the agreements its government makes with other governments, agreements on which may hang the issues of war and peace; but a democracy can no more be satisfied by the publication of treaties “when fixed” than it would be by the publication of laws “when fixed.” Indeed it is hard to conceive of any law so important to us and to future generations as are the treaties the next few years will bring forth. Those who are sacrificing themselves without stint in this war have an undeniable right to be honestly and fully informed on all treaties which may serve to end wars or initiate new ones. Such is national psychology and such may be the

exigencies of a particular situation that public opinion will give a grudging sanction to a treaty or agreement already adopted by the Executive which it would have rejected or profoundly changed had it been consulted before ratification.

Governments as Boards of Directors

Senator Borah’s resolution provided for open debate in the Senate on all treaties, unless by a four-fifths vote the Senate should order secret discussion of certain points. Not a very revolutionary proposal this! In support of his resolution he made a powerful indictment of the consequences of secret diplomacy as illustrated by this war (see the report of his speech elsewhere in this issue). His opponents urged in part that his resolution was unnecessary because the Senate could now at any time by majority vote hold public discussion of a treaty, but their principle objection was the impossibility of negotiating treaties in public. Senator Knox thought such a step comparable in folly with public meetings of the board of directors of a company which desired to beat its rivals in securing a contract. False and vicious, from our viewpoint, as was the Senator’s simile, it is a revealing expression of a type of mind unhappily too common among men of all nations. Will Senator Knox, and those who think like him, have the hardihood to deny that it is these secret meetings of rival “boards of directors” which are largely responsible for the present world agony?

We are reminded of a cartoon in London *Punch*, dating to a time before the war. Sir Edward Grey is shown at a card table holding his cards in his hand; by his side are two workmen representing Ramsay MacDonald and John Burns, who were at that time voicing the growing demand for open diplomacy. “Put your hand on the table,” they say to him. Sir Edward Grey answers, “And let my opponents see it?” Here is the whole philosophy of modern diplomacy with its doctrine of competing national interests, a doctrine which makes secret negotiation of treaties almost inevitable. Public discussion of the sort Senator Borah is advocating would do much to stop such cynical wickedness as that which made it possible for huge armies and navies to be launched at one another in August, 1914, each in the conviction that it fought in defense of home and country.

We are bound however, to say that we do not believe that congressional discussion by itself is likely to achieve very much until we have a new spirit of internationalism and a new conception on the part of the peoples of all lands that they have ideals and friendships and interests that transcend the boundaries of nationalistic rivalries. That is why Mr. Gompers, our Tory press, and our church leaders, in their opposition to all attempts to bring together the peoples of the world, as distinct from the governments, are unwitting protectors of the old order out of which have grown and will grow wars and oppressions innumerable. We have become accustomed to their short-sighted leadership; what is gravely disquieting is the President’s new stand. It can but have a destructive effect upon the *morale* of his liberal supporters in England and France as well as in this country. It is perhaps not yet too late for him to correct the blunder. If Senator Borah’s resolution was technically inexpedient “at this time,” the President might explain that fact without forsaking his own liberal policy and giving the reac-

tionaries (who are his enemies and ours) a chance to mock at idealistic words about open diplomacy and leagues of nations which the President does not try to translate into action.

The Enemy in Our Midst

Few utterances of the President have been more vigorous or unmistakable in their meaning than his address on taxation delivered before Congress on May 27. He candidly avowed the inequalities of the present law and pointed out, as many radicals and socialists have been doing for the past year, that \$4,000,000,000 were not enough to raise by taxation. New levies, he recommended, should fall chiefly upon war profits, incomes and luxuries.

We hope thoughtful men will follow the President's lead and do some courageous and public spirited thinking on this whole problem—the proper relation of taxation to loans; the dangers of inflation; the incidence of taxation and above all the abolition of profiteering. On this last subject the President's words deserve quotation:

"The profiteering that cannot be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country, can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable."

Senator Borah followed up this subject by a demand for the evidence as to profiteering in order that Congress might act effectively. In an able and vigorous address he said that it was "up to Congress to justify the conviction of Mrs. Stokes" by proving by its acts that the Government was not for the profiteers.

It must be remembered that in the campaign against profiteering whose existence the President so frankly acknowledged, taxation is only one weapon; it is not enough simply to tax unjust profits after they are made. For example: the packers have been repeatedly accused of profiteering. That means, if true, that their prices are too high and work especial injustice upon the poor. If the Government appropriates most or all of this excess profit by taxation, it does not remedy the injustice. It offers no compulsion to lower prices, it merely takes over that which the profiteers have already collected in unfair proportion from those least able to pay. Profiteering is one of those diseases which are better prevented than cured. Fear of heavy taxation is not a sufficient deterrent as the Government itself is beginning to recognize. We trust that the new regulations it has imposed upon the packers will prove an effective guarantee of prices which will make profiteering impossible in that essential industry. It is curious how much easier it is to sentence religious pacifists (like the Rev. Waldron of Vermont, and the Russellites of Brooklyn) and political critics of the Government (like Mrs. Stokes) to ten and even twenty years' imprisonment, than it is to put one profiteer in jail. Yet who is the real enemy of the country and of mankind?

The Coming of State Capitalism

Recent events have called public attention to the rapid march of governmental control of big business. Mr. Secretary McAdoo has calmly dismissed the once mighty railroad presidents from their seats without a word of thanks for their not entirely

unselfish labors. By simple decree Mr. McAdoo has largely increased the railroad fares whose reduction was once the professed object of popular politicians, and he has carried through a merger of the Express Companies—all with the general approval or acquiescence of the public. Part of that approval arises from confidence in Mr. McAdoo's ability, part from recognition of the need of extraordinary measures to meet war-time conditions and part from a general, though vague, realization that the day of private capitalism is nearly done. War-time efficiency has demanded state control in order to secure unity, avoid waste and keep down profiteering. This transition to state capitalism has been made over night, and we shall remain in this stage at least for the duration of the war. Nor can we ever simply go back to the old way. But it is not enough passively to accept this fact. Even during the war it is important that we should understand the situation clearly so as to plan wisely for after the war conditions.

What we have got now is merely a new form of capitalism, a form that is proving very agreeable to many railroad stockholders. The avowed willingness of the Western Union Telegraph Company to be taken over by the Government rather than to accede to the mild plan of toleration of the Telegraphers' Union enjoined upon it by the Labor Board is proof not only of a stubborn class interest which even *The New York Times* condemns, but also of an intelligent appreciation of the virtues of a scheme of government control that guarantees to stockholders a sufficient, if moderate, interest—and no worry.

Of course state capitalism is only tolerable as a temporary measure and as a stage on the road to industrial democracy. Among its many grave objections are that it leaves the present obsolete wage system unaltered; it tends to bring the organized employees of the government into politics. They cannot well strike against the Government, and they may instead complicate the decision of grave political matters by using their votes to barter for wage increases. Our experience with pension legislation should warn us in this connection. With state capitalism government will inevitably become more and more bureaucratic. Our Garfields, Hoovers and McAdoos will be multiplied indefinitely. Vast powers will be conferred upon these dictators. If, as now, they are made responsible only to the President, they will be altogether beyond the control of Congress. These conditions can mean only the enormous growth of the bureaucratic State as the industrial as well as political overlord—omnipotent and omniscient. Where all this leads to is plain for all men to see. It leads straight to Prussia. Germany has long enjoyed State Capitalism tempered by social reform. The system has been all too effective. It has made the State the be-all and end-all of life; it has fostered that Prussian religion of the State against which the world now fights. It has produced efficiency—yes, but it has notoriously failed to create free personalities, cooperating not in servility to the State, but in the mutual service of ennobling fellowship. And only in such fellowship of free men is life.

We forget at our peril that State capitalism is the foe, not the friend, of democracy in politics and industry. We may rejoice that under it we are well served by able men during the war, but we must recognize the necessity even now of the hardest sort of thinking and planning if we are to gain emancipation and establish real industrial freedom and cooperation.

The Essential Truth of Christianity

RUFUS M. JONES

Many of our readers in their correspondence with us have frequently raised in searching form such fundamental questions as these: In what sense do you interpret Christianity? How does it differ from Humanism? Is it adequate for the building of the new world? In general we may hope that the whole magazine rather than any formal statement will be the best answer to these questions. We do not believe that they can be answered by the formulation of any creed upon which the editors might agree. In the hope, however, that we may shed a clearer light upon the subject, we are proposing to publish from time to time papers by different leaders in Christian thought, setting forth their individual viewpoints. We do this in the belief that there will be found in them a unity of spirit more valuable than a formal unity of expression. We are glad to begin the series with this contribution from a well known member of our Editorial Board.—The Editors.

THERE are few questions more difficult to answer than the question, What Is Christianity? Every attempt to answer it reveals the peculiar focus of interest in the mind of the writer, but it leaves the main question still asking for a new answer.

"Always it asketh, asketh," and each answer, to say the least, is inadequate. Harnack, Loisy and Tolstoi have given three characteristic answers to the great question. Their books are touched with genius and will long continue to be read, but, like the other books, they, too, reveal the writers rather than solve the central problem.

One of the greatest difficulties about the whole matter is the difficulty of deciding where to look for the essential traits of Christianity. Are they to be found in the teaching of Jesus? Are they revealed in the message of St. Paul? Are they embodied in the Messianic hope? Are they exhibited in the primitive apostolic church? Are they set forth in the great creeds of orthodoxy? Are they expressed in the imperial authoritative church? Are they to be discovered in the Protestantism of the modern world? This catalogue of preliminary questions shows how complicated the subject really is. To start in on any one of these lines would be of necessity to arrive at a partial and one-sided answer.

Nowhere can we find pure and unalloyed Christianity; always we have it mixed and combined with something else, more or less foreign to it. The creeds contain a larger element of Greek philosophy than of the pure, original gospel. The Messianic hope is far more Jewish than it is

"Christian." The imperial authoritative church is Christianity interpreted through the Roman genius for organization and merged and fused with the age-long faiths and customs of pagan peoples. Protestantism is an amazingly complex blend of ideas and ideals and everywhere interwoven with the long processes of history. Even this did not drop from the sky ready made! Nor did St. Paul's message flash upon him with the Damascus vision, as a pure heaven-presented truth. It proves to be a very difficult task to find one's way back to the pure, unalloyed teaching of Jesus, and strangely enough, the moment one endeavors to constitute this by itself "Christianity," and undertakes to turn it into a set of commands and to make it a "new law," he ends with a dry legalism and not a vital, universal Christianity.

What, then, is Christianity? In answering this question we cannot confine ourselves to the teaching and the work of Jesus. Important as it is to go "back to Jesus," that is not enough. We cannot fully comprehend the meaning of Christianity until we take into account the fact that the invisible, resurrected Christ is the continuation through the ages of the same revelation begun in the life and teaching of Jesus. Galilee and Judea mark only one stage of the gospel, which is, in its fulness, an eternal gospel. The Christian revelation which came to light first in one Life—its master interpretation and incarnation—has since been going forward in a continuous and unbroken manifestation of Christ through many lives and through many groups and through the spiritual achievements of all those who have lived by Him. Christianity is, thus,

the revelation of God through personal life—God humanely revealed. St. Paul and the writer of the Fourth Gospel were the first to reach this profound insight in its fuller meaning, though it is plainly suggested in some of the sayings of Jesus and in the pentecostal experiences of the first Christians. It is the very heart of Pauline and Johannine Christianity. Important as is the backward look to Jesus in both these writers, the central emphasis is unmistakably upon the inward experience of the invisible, spiritual Christ. This is the expectation in the fourth Gospel: Greater things than these shall ye do when the Spirit comes upon you. This is the mystery, the secret, of the gospel. St. Paul says, Christ in you.

If this is the right clue, Christianity is not a new law, nor an institution, nor a creed, nor a body of doctrine, nor a millennial hope. It is a type of life, it is a way of living. The most essential thing about it is the fact of the incursion of God into human life, the revelation of the eternal in the midst of time, the new discovery which it brought of God's nature and character. We nowhere else come so close to the essential truth of Christianity as we do in the Life and experience of Jesus. The Life at every point floods over and transcends the teaching. He is the most complete and adequate exhibition of what I have called the incursion of God into human life, but even so He is the beginning, not the end, of the revelation of God through humanity—the Christ-revelation of God—and this Christ-revelation of God *is* God, so far as He is at all adequately known.

Some folks talk as though God were a kind of composite Being, got by adding up the God of the natural order, the God of the Old Testament, and the God as Father about whom Jesus taught. He is, according to this scheme, in some way a compound aggregate of infinite power, irresistible justice and eternal love. Sometimes one "attribute" is predominant, and sometimes another, while in some mysterious way all the dissonant attributes get "reconciled." This is surely boggy ground to build upon.

Christianity is essentially, I should say, a unique revelation of God. Here for the first time the race discovers that God identifies Himself with humanity, is in the stream of it, is suffering with us, is in moral conflict with sin and evil, is conquering through the travail and tragedy of finite persons, and is eternally, in mind and heart and

will, a God of triumphing Love. No texts adequately "prove" this mighty truth. We cannot tie it down to "sayings," though there are "sayings" which declare it. The life of Jesus, the supreme decisions through which He expressed His purpose, the spirit which dominates Him and guides His decisive actions, make the truth plain that God meant *that* to Him and that His way of life revealed that kind of God.

Through all the fusions and confusions of history and through all the vagaries of man's tortuous course since the church began to be built, Christ as eternal Spirit has gone on revealing this truth about God and demonstrating the victorious power of this way of life. The making of a Kingdom of God in the world, the spread of the brother-spirit, the expansion of the love-method, the increase of co-operation, sympathy, and service, the continued incursion of the divine into the life of the human, these are the things now and always which indicate the vitality and progress of Christianity, the uninterrupted revelation of God.

Always, in every period of history, the essential truth of Christianity must be revealed and expressed in and through a medium not altogether adapted to it. It is always living and working in a world more or less alien to it. It has at any stage only partially realized its ideal and only in a fragmentary way achieved the goal toward which it is moving. It means endless conquest and ever fresh winning of unwon territory. It must be for us all a vision and a venture, it must be a thing of faith and forecast. At the same time it is, in a very real sense, experience and achievement. God *has* entered into humanity. Love has revealed its redeeming power. Grace is as much a reality as mountains are. The Kingdom of God though not all in sight yet is, I believe, as sure as gravitation. The invisible, eternal Christ, living in the soul of man, revealing His will in moral and spiritual victories in personal lives, is, I am convinced, as genuine a fact as electricity is. But we shall see *all* that Christianity means only when the living totality of the revelation of God through humanity is complete.

A Notable Pamphlet

The vexed problem of European nationality is admirably surveyed in an informing pamphlet recently issued by the World Peace Foundation. A copy of this pamphlet—which possesses unusual value by reason of a useful language map of Europe printed in colors—may be obtained from the Secretary of the Foundation at 40 Mount Vernon street, Boston, Mass.

The War Department and the Conscientious Objector

In the President's order of March 20th concerning Conscientious Objectors, he stated that the Secretary of War would later make provision for those who should refuse non-combatant service. On June 1st, Mr. Baker made public his instructions concerning these men, now segregated at various camps. Briefly, they provide for furloughing men for agricultural work, or in some cases, for service with the Friends' Reconstruction Unit. Men in agricultural work must present monthly reports from a disinterested source that they are working to the best of their ability and they must agree not to receive for their services more than the pay of a private plus subsistence. They are not to depress labor standards by working for less than the prevailing rate, but it is suggested that any money they may receive over the remuneration of privates should be contributed to the Red Cross.

A Board of Inquiry is set up to pass upon all cases, consisting of Major Stoddard of the Judge Advocate's office, Judge Mack of the Federal Court, and Dean Stone of Columbia Law School. Objectors to whom furlough is denied or who feel that they cannot accept the terms under which it is offered will be court-martialled and sent to the Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth.

While of course this order is not an absolute recognition of conscience it is difficult to see how any government which is committed to the principle of conscription in a time when the war psychology everywhere holds sway, could issue more liberal instructions. Thus to respect the individual's sense of right and wrong in the midst of this stupendous war is to strengthen the foundations of a doctrine of the relation of the individual to the state upon which the fair social structure of tomorrow shall be built—a social structure utterly different from that Prussian system which is the prison house of all free spirits. It may be added that the order can be as thoroughly justified on practical military considerations as by a philosophy of individual freedom, for the reason that it keeps conscientious objection from becoming a continual and increasing source of agitation as it is in England.

Fine as this order is, it does not mean that all need of watchful interest in the conscientious objector is at an end. Not all army officers seem to appreciate the wisdom and fairness of the department's order, and some stories are told of petty persecution, downright brutality and of treatment evidently contrary to the liberal intention of the order. An order of April 27, providing for court-martial of objectors who are sullen and defiant, insincere, or propagandist, has been used in some camps to justify actions opposed to the whole spirit of the war department's policy. We believe, however, that these cases will be remedied by the Board of Inquiry. It must not be forgotten that no final solutions of our problems will be reached while it is possible or necessary for the State to compel men either to do a certain task morally abhorrent to them, or to buy their freedom by some equivalent service fixed by the State—a service which may be in violation of their own sense of vocation.

In rebuilding the structure of our American life after the war, surely we must strive for a system under which there will no

longer be "a deliberate conflict between the massed power of government and the soul of one righteous man." The phrase is Gilbert Murray's and comes from his remarkable article in the January number of *The Hibbert Journal* on "The Soul as It Is and How to Deal With It." He tells briefly the story of two saints of our own day, Gandhi, the Indian reformer, and Stephen Hobhouse, the English Quaker. Both greatly served their fellowmen, both suffered uncomplainingly for conscience' sake at the hands of government. It is in the emergence of such personalities that we find something of the answer to that terrible indictment, "The Reign of Nonsense in the World, in the State and in Human Life," published in the same number of *The Hibbert Journal*. It is by its capacity to produce such free and glorious personalities that we shall judge the civilization of tomorrow.

"A Statesman of the Calibre Samuel Gompers"

Our American Federation of Labor delegates have come back from Europe full of sympathy for their unfortunate brethren in England and France because in those less happy lands organized labor possesses "no statesman of the calibre of Samuel Gompers." No wonder Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy, who accompanied the delegation, is obliged to admit that "*suaviter in modo* is apparently not considered an essential in American trade union diplomacy."

We will not here and now attempt to discuss the attitude of the A. F. of L. to European workers. Rather let us try to suggest certain reasons why a statesman of the calibre of Mr. Gompers cannot easily understand and share the political and social idealism of his European brethren. The difference runs far back into the whole conception of the labor movement. Mr. Gompers has proved a very able leader of craft unionism. The A. F. of L. under his leadership has become a very powerful organization, but the fact remains that it includes only some two and a half million out of thirty million American workers. (Various reasonable deductions of agricultural workers, etc., reduce the number of those who constitute "a potential trade union membership" to some twelve to sixteen millions.) This Gompsonian Federation of Labor still thinks largely in terms of the different and sometimes rival trades instead of in terms of industry; it has as a whole cared little for organizing the unskilled laborers particularly if they were negroes or immigrants, who most of all needed the help and strength which organization alone can give the workers. Mr. Gompers himself has seen much accomplished during his many years as President of the A. F. of L. simply by collective bargaining within the crafts and as a result he has come to scorn other weapons. Apparently in his social vision he sees only powerful unions winning ever larger wages and greater leisure for their members. In this narrow conception there is no place for internationalism or for that fundamentally changed world for which all labor parties in England and France yearn and for which they are uniting politically as well as industrially.

The Myth of the Yellow Peril

DAVID STARR JORDAN

IN considering our relations with Japan, there are a few simple elementary facts our people ought to remember.

A Few Facts About Japan

There are something more than half as many people in Japan as in the United States. They occupy a territory (including Korea) not twice the size of California, barely a fifteenth of this is fit for cultivation, and plenty of good grazing and grass lands are unoccupied because the Japanese farmer has not learned to raise much except rice, tea and silk, and makes little use of beef products. As Japan has little coal or ore, it is a land of scanty resources. But her people love Japan and like to live there even though crowded, for they are eminently gregarious, they have learned the fine art of getting on with each other and "their customs fit them like a garment."

The people in Japan are mostly poor but not illiterate. Education is compulsory, including English in the middle and higher schools, and everybody reads the newspapers.

There are in Japan all sorts of people, good, bad, wise, foolish, honest, crooked, refined, vulgar, generous, greedy, that can be found in any other civilized country. From Europeans as a whole they differ mainly in having better manners, in caring less for privacy and in forming their opinions group fashion rather than individually.

The Japanese are generally honest. The story that Japanese banks employ Chinese tellers is a familiar American lie. In 1911, there were 2,113 Japanese banks, whereof one had two Chinese tellers, one of these, or fifty per cent of the whole being in jail for embezzlement when this count was made.

It is not true that Japan is an autocracy like Germany. It is more like the government of Great Britain. The Mikado exercises little personal influence, and the Ministry is chosen by the dominant party. There have been five or six changes in the last eight years. The suffrage is limited practically to those who pay taxes, but all groups take part in supporting or denouncing the administration. Partizanship is sometimes hot and editors will print attacks they will not make

in conversation. Speech is bound by rules of courtesy not recognized in journalism.

There are in Japan, aristocrats, militarists, imperialists, exploiters, but in no alarming numbers. It is quite untrue to speak of Japan as another Prussia. Japan has also her pacifists and her statesmen. The people are eager, ambitious and interested in the affairs of their neighbors, her dependence commercially being on the United States and China.

Japan has a very few rich men who favor an imperialistic policy, in which, as in Germany, the Government would be a partner and would shoulder all losses.

There is in Japan a close clique of "older statesmen," cautious and considerate, largely graduates of the Imperial University and mostly from the four great "fighting clans" of Satsuma, Tosa, Chosu and Settsu.

The present premier, Viscount Terauchi, is a soldier, of the type of Kitchener,—patient, taciturn and taking no chances with the reputation of Japan.

Japanese Relations with America

The Japanese people know America much better relatively than we know them. Their judgment rests largely on the 2,000 or more graduates of American Universities spread all over Japan,—keen-witted and broad-minded, loyal to America and to American ideals. Though there are in Japan a few reckless politicians and a yellow journal or two, there is little danger of any serious misunderstanding.

The attitude of each government toward the other for the last fifty years has been beyond reproach. The sources of friction have been local and personal. The California school question had no significance in itself. The rather ignorant school-board of San Francisco saw no objection to an "Oriental School." But the Japanese disclaim being "orientals" in a collective sense. They made the great blunder of appealing to their home newspapers instead of securing an injunction in the nearest Federal Court.

The Alien Land Law of California was handled in a fashion offensive to Japan. I believe that no

state in our Union should be allowed to raise an international question. Any law so doing ought to be declared unconstitutional. But the California Alien Land Law will stand at least until the Japanese test it in the United States Supreme Court. This they are not likely to do, as their real interest in it is its reflex on home politics. At every snub, real or apparent, the opposition attacks the ministry for its lack of a "vigorous foreign policy." So the law will probably not be tested, and its operations cause little inconvenience as land can be bought in the name of Japanese born in America, these native-born becoming in due time citizens. There is crying need of a law by which aliens in the United States should be recognized as wards of the government, under national protection. It is under international treaties that their rights are established. For our own protection as well as for theirs, Japanese, Chinese and Hindus actually resident in this country should become citizens.

The Japanese do not wish to have their homeless laborers brought to the United States, for they lead Americans to a false judgment of Japan. We judge by what we see, and most of the Japanese farming class in the United States were brought, uneducated, from the rice-fields of Okayama, Yamaguchi and Hiroshima to the sugar-plantations of Hawaii, where they were virtually serfs. After Hawaii was annexed, in 1900, the higher wages of California brought them across in large numbers. Since the "Gentlemen's Agreement" in 1907, practically no Japanese laborers have entered California.

We may be assured that the diplomatists of Japan in their relations with us and with their allies, will stand by the highest standards associated with the word "gentlemen." There is a dignified pride in Japan almost unique in the relations of nations.

Educated Japanese confess that they do not understand why our government should permit the publication of notorious falsehoods such as have been promulgated, for example, by a certain group of American newspapers.

The Magdalena Bay stories of 1912 represented the grossest kind of slanderous invention. These deceived even the majority of the Senate at that time, whence the Lodge Resolution which President Taft, better informed, refused to sign. At that time, Magdalena Bay had a crab and turtle

cannery, owned by a gentleman of Los Angeles. It employed about half a dozen Japanese fishermen and as many Chinese, with a hundred Mexicans to do the packing. It was not successful, and it has been closed, to be replaced by another cannery with some Japanese fishermen from San Diego.

The friction between Japan and the United States, alleged or real, is traceable mainly to two sources: German intrigue, which we can understand, and the efforts of the Hearst journals, which we do not understand.

The Problems of China and Russia

So far as the United States is concerned, our grievance against Japan centers not in anything she has done, but in what she may do in China. The annexation of Korea is an act not above criticism, though there are two sides to the question. The Japanese took over from Russia the lease of the railroads of South Manchuria. The government owns 51 per cent of the stock and guarantees dividends of 6 per cent on the remainder. The great firm of Mitsui Brothers controls the soya bean output—the great industry of South Manchuria. The lease expires in 1923. The Japanese people have 200,000 graves on the road from Antung and Port Arthur to Harbin. At the expiration of the lease Japan will execute another and will never relinquish her hold on South Manchuria. This remark is a prophecy, not a statement of a moral principle.

Nearly twenty years ago a Japanese scholar explained to me that Japan felt herself on the edge of a volcano, under conditions which forced her to assure her own safety. China, her neighbor, with eight times her population, had, in fact, no government at all and was sure soon to fall into convulsion—an explosion that might be repeated at intervals before stability should result.

China was in convulsion in 1900 and again in 1911, and the story is still far from finished. It is indeed true that Japan has a first interest in these matters, and however unwise her demonstrations may have been, it is plain that the United States must concede to her certain duties which may involve corresponding rights.

As to the Siberian question, we know little of the actual facts and still less of their bearing on the future. Some of us have little faith in the permanence of the Bolsheviki, and we know that

very few German prisoners in Siberia will ever go back to Germany. They have had enough of dynastic discipline. While there are many intelligent and patriotic Japanese who believe that their people should expand into Siberia, that is not yet a living issue. We can trust the discretion of the British and American commanders of the Asiatic fleet, and we may well believe that the premier, Terauchi, will permit no act not desired by Great Britain and the United States. The people of Japan recognize the fact of what is virtually perpetual alliance between these two great centers of democracy, and every motive of interest and of patriotism will prompt her to align herself with them. We may be sure that her leaders will never knowingly place her at cross-purposes. That some Japanese, educated in Germany, have adopted Prussian ideals and have hoped to work

them out by the use of the army, cannot be denied, but these, as I have already said, are relatively few, and the current is against them. The feeling towards America is warm and real. It is a common saying that the great ocean unites the two peoples; it does not separate, and many influences bring them closer and closer together. More and more the Japanese think American thoughts. Not long ago, I spoke in a temple at Shiba, in Tokyo, and a hundred little Japanese children greeted me with "America"—

"Land where our fathers died,
Land of the pilgrim's pride."

In time they will come to think of this as really true of our land and their land as one, and the conception of world-patriotism widens their vision and their sympathies.

Justice—Even for I. W. W.

The prosecution has rested its case in the great Chicago trial of the I. W. W. The papers, naturally have carried only the sensational features of the testimony—and when one considers "the inarticulated public demand that the I. W. W. news-story produce a thrill" the paucity of sensational stories may in itself be evidence of the fact that the I. W. W. has been somewhat disappointing in its role as the incarnation of all the villainies. The prosecution has set out to prove conspiracy, virtually it charges the whole organization with deliberate attempt to block the war. To make its case and still more to substantiate the popular impression of the I. W. W., it must prove clearly not merely foolish, unpatriotic and probably illegal utterances by individual members but overt acts of violence and sabotage and above all conspiracy to do these deeds by leading officials of the organization. There are two main reasons why the average American who instinctively has no sympathy with the I. W. W. should follow this case with care and attention.

1. It is of vital importance for us all to know whether the I. W. W. agitation is a product of sullen depravity of mind, utterly unjustified in fact, or whether it springs inevitably from a soil of injustice and oppression; whether it is wholly criminal or whether it embodies the hopes and passions of men struggling for freedom and fullness of life denied them by our industrial system. If the I. W. W. is struggling—however mistakenly—for freedom, that struggle will go on and on, despite lynching parties and courts, so long as tyranny endures. And now here in Chicago we are given an opportunity in a well ordered trial to ascertain vital industrial facts. According to the way we deal with these facts, future wars and bloody revolutions will be caused or avoided.

2. It is part of the creed of every liberty-loving American

that even criminals are entitled to justice. If any considerable section of the workers comes to believe that these men now on trial have not received fair treatment and an adequate and proper defense, that conviction will be the fuel of future fires of revolt.

It must be remembered that justice in legal cases is very expensive. Most of the defendants have been in jail since last October. Already their number has been reduced for one reason or another from the 166 originally indicted to 101, and possibly one or two more of these will be dismissed by the court for lack of evidence connecting them with the case. But these liberated men have suffered (as have any who may later be acquitted) months and months of confinement in a crowded jail. For this as things are there is no help. There is the more urgency therefore that a fair trial be assured. Judge Landis is doing his part, as a just and upright judge.

The defence will seek to prove that there was no conspiracy against the Government in the prosecution of the war and that the activities of the I. W. W. during the war as before it were directed solely to securing redress of economic wrongs. To make their case it will be necessary to introduce a great mass of testimony as to industrial conditions supported by witnesses from all over the United States. This will necessarily involve a heavy expenditure. A large sum is still needed. The organization itself has contributed generously, but all over the country its leaders and members have been under suspicion or arrest. Public sentiment, and in some cases we fear official action, have put every conceivable difficulty in the way of collecting funds. How much do you care for justice in this case? Write your answer to Mr. Roger Baldwin, at the National Civil Liberties Bureau, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

British Christians Send Greetings to Russia

We believe that this letter, signed as it is by an unusually varied and representative group of British Christians, is significant of a new reaching-forth after Christian brotherhood; a new search for distinctive ways in which the church can express internationalism and good will, and so make for larger and richer fellowship upon the earth. May not American church and social leaders find here a suggestion for a similar service?—THE EDITORS.

BELOVED BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN CHRIST,—

We have heard much of your recent distress and sufferings, and in silence we have sympathized with and prayed for you. Forgetting our own sufferings, we have listened breathlessly to all news coming from Russia, expecting that the dark clouds hanging over you might soon pass away and a brighter sky with shining stars appear.

Following the custom of primitive Christians when all communities used persistently to pray for any community stricken by misery or persecution, we, men and women of the British Christian community, regardless of our differences and Church denominations, are now seeking to unite and to pray for the great Russian community. May God the All-Merciful listen to our prayer, and bring peace and joy to your hearts, unity to your people and strength to your Church!

Believe us, neither the political nor the military alliance between your country and ours, but an alliance incomparably deeper and more solid dictates our sympathy with and prayer for you. It is the alliance of which Christ, the Sufferer and the Victor, is the foundation and inspiration. . . . During the last three years of our common struggle and sufferings many of our people have visited your country, and have come back to tell us the story of the wonderful attachment of the Russian people to Christ. We have been told that the most comforting vision for your fighting sons at the front was the vision of Christ, and that Christ's dominion has not ceased in the hearts of the people at home. And that this is true notwithstanding much which on the surface would appear to the contrary.

We have discovered a similar experience among ourselves during the present war. We know that Christ is the ever ready Comforter of our fighting men, and the true constructive power at home. However important and just were the military and political causes of the war, the conviction is now steadily growing among us that the greatest spiritual values are now at stake, and that spiritual issues may result from it to a degree as yet undreamt of.

This is not only the belief of our clergy, but perhaps even more of the laity, both men and women. May the Holy Spirit keep us in this belief and strengthen us more and more.

Especially are we glad to recognize among us the attitude of Labor towards Christ. Our Labor organizations have never considered Christ as their enemy. But now they know Him more and more as their friend. Our people are being delivered from the misconception that Christ is a monopoly of the rich and powerful. Though sometimes it is hard for an industrial worker in factory or mine to keep before him the vision of Christ, we are thankful that our workmen not only have not lost this vision, but in many cases have brought it through recent struggles and sufferings to the foremost place in their minds. However deeply they feel the shortcomings of the

Church in its effort to bring in Christ's Kingdom on earth, they never doubt that Christ is their friend.

Not a few of our Labor leaders are definitely Christian, some of them being as prominent in the pulpit as in the workshop. We may even hope that soon Labor will become the very backbone of our British Christianity. It has displayed a truly Christian spirit in its pronouncements and in its human charity during the war. It is becoming more and more conscious that the Christian religion is not merely an ornament of life, but that it is the practical foundation of a just and more God-like world-organization. And because Labor has risen to such a spiritual conception of the world's politics, we are not afraid that when it comes to power, it will use brutal and destructive methods against those who differ from it in national and political opinions. Its Christian faith will dictate its policy and make it humane and constructive.

And so when we count up our losses and gains during this war, we dare to hope that our real and durable gain from it will be the faith of all our people that Christ is the highest value in the world. . . .

With this strong faith, regained and revived, enlarged and deepened, we speak to you, beloved brothers and sisters of our Christian sister-community of Russia.

May we all be enlightened by God the Father, strengthened by Christ and inspired by the Holy Spirit.

T. W. ALLEN (Director of the Co-operative Wholesale Society), LADY FRANCES BALFOUR, REV. E. W. BARNES (Master of the Temple), EARL BEAUCHAMP, A. CLUTTON BROCK (author), GEORGE CADBURY (member of the Society of Friends), PROFESSOR DAVID S. CAIRNS (University of Aberdeen), SIR FRANCIS CHAMPNEYS (past President of the Royal Society of Medicine), WILSON CLAYTON (Director of the Co-operative Wholesale Society), RT. REV. JAMES COOPER (Moderator of the Church of Scotland), IRENE COX (National General Superintendent, Y. W. C. A.), WILL CROOKS, M.P., J. M. DENT (publisher), REV. R. J. DRUMMOND (Moderator-Elect of the United Free Church of Scotland), REV. W. H. FRERE (Superior of the Community of the Resurrection), ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. (General Secretary of the Labour Party), HENRY T. HODGKIN (Secretary, Friends' Foreign Mission), GEORGE LANSBURY (Editor of *The Labor Herald*), ALBERT MANSBRIDGE (Founder of the Workers' Educational Association), PROFESSOR ALEXANDER MARTIN (New College, Edinburgh), CANON J. H. B. MASTERMAN (Chairman of the Anglo-Russian Society), J. H. OLDHAN (Secretary, Continuation Committee of the World's Missionary Conference), THE BISHOP OF OXFORD, J. L. PATON (Headmaster, Manchester Grammar School), PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE (Mansfield College, Oxford), CANON J. G. SIMPSON (St. Paul's Cathedral), F. HERBERT STEAD (Warden of Browning Hall), J. H. THOMAS, M.P. (General Secretary, Student Christian Movement), PRINCIPAL ALEXANDER WHYTE (New College, Edinburgh), RT. REV. ANDREW WALLACE WILLIAMSON (Ex-Moderator of the Church of Scotland), THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

Is This the Crucial Hour?

"The ideals for which we are fighting, as they have been set forth by the President, command the consciences of Christians, and the churches cannot but stand loyally with the nation for their triumph. But that does not exhaust our obligations as Christians. Theoretically we hold that our allegiance to Christ is superior to our allegiance to country, and that Christ unites us in His Body with men of every nation; but in this hideous conflict no Church has moved to establish relations with fellow-Christians in enemy lands that might assist in ending the intolerable conditions which not only set man to slay fellow-men, but disciple of Jesus to slaughter fellow-disciple. . . . For companies of British and German Christians to meet to receive the Lord's Supper in their respective camps, symbol of their union with Christ and with one another in Him, and then go forth to bomb and spray with liquid fire and tear each other to bits with shrapnel, is the ghastly self-slaughter of the Body of Christ, and means who knows what anguish to its Head."—Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, "In a Day of Social Rebuilding."

THESE are not the words of a pacifist, a pro-German or a Bolshevik, but of the pastor of a great church, a professor in a famous theological seminary, and a loyal supporter of the war, who is now making religious addresses to our soldiers at the front. Surely Dr. Coffin speaks for unnumbered thousands of his fellow Christians in voicing an intolerable shame that Christian churches in all nations have risen to no sense of unity, have felt no irresistible compulsion of spiritual power which would enable them to be more than faithful handmaidens of the government in each of the warring States. How can men ever be persuaded of the unique place and function of the Christian church if in the hour of the world's supreme agony she has no distinctive message, if in this day of her trial she lifts above the shouts of battle and the cries of the wounded no compelling voice of penitence, of forgiveness, of brotherhood restored?

Some such thought has moved the Christians of Scandinavia to send out an invitation which is thus officially reported by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America:

"The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has received an invitation, signed by H. Ostfeld, Bishop of Seland, Denmark; Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, Sweden, and Jens Tandberg, Bishop of Christiania, Norway, to attend, through its chosen representatives, an international ecumenical conference, to be held probably either at Upsala or Christiania. The Pope and other prelates of the Roman Catholic Church have been invited, with twenty-five Protestant communions and certain special groups.

"Representatives from both neutral and belligerent countries have received invitations, with the understanding that careful arrangements will be made so that representatives from the various belligerent countries will not meet, publicly or privately. Sectional meetings will be held between neutrals and representatives of one side, and the question of a general meeting will arise only after complete unanimity has been established with regard to the subjects comprised in the agenda and on the assumption that both parties wish for such a general meeting.

"The subjects proposed for discussion are:

"(a) The spiritual unity in Christ of His Disciples, without loss of loyalty either to the talents and duties entrusted to nations or to the creeds they profess; facts and their expression.

"(b) The shortcomings of the church with regard to the realization of Christian brotherhood and of the spirit of Christ in all human relations. Penitence of the church.

"(c) Possibilities and duties of the church in counteracting the evil passions of war and promoting that frame of mind which makes for righteousness and goodwill among nations.

"(d) The Christian Doctrine on the sanctity of law and on the work of international legislation.

"(e) Actual church problems viewed practically and universally, e. g., the Mission Field."

It will be noticed how soberly and carefully this invitation is worded and how obviously sincere is the effort to avoid any partisan political pitfalls. Nevertheless the Administrative Committee of the Federal Council reported on April 1 that "it was agreed that it was not advisable for the Federal Council to take definite action on the matter at this time."

In response to certain letters of inquiry and protest, the Administrative Committee instructed its recording secretary, on June 13, to reply "that we are awaiting further information on this matter."

In Great Britain the response to the idea of some such conference has shown a conviction that the time for Christians to act is now while the need is greatest—not in some indefinite future. As far back as November of last year, "The British Council for Promoting an International Christian Meeting" was organized. It included "men and women of very varied religious and political opinions," all of them leaders in Christian work. Some time ago we received from England notice of a meeting of "All who desire to promote the idea of International Christian Brotherhood" held in one of London's largest public halls "to consider the duty of the churches in regard to the present situation." The chairman was the famous lawyer Lord Parmoor, and the speakers included among others the Dean of Worcester, Father Nicholas Velimirovic (of Serbia—Eastern Orthodox Church), Rev. Principal Selbie (President of the Free Church Council), Rev. Canon Donaldson and Rev. Thomas Phillips.

If men of such weight and soberness of judgment in Britain can lend their influence to the cause, the most patriotic Americans need hardly fear that they will compromise their loyalty to their country by reasserting their loyalty to the conception of "International Christian Brotherhood" which once captured the allegiance of men of all races and tribes and classes within the Roman Empire and made them one in Christ.

In the years to come men will look back with gratitude and praise for every effort, however feeble and unsuccessful, to rebind the broken ties of solidarity between the workers of the world in the midst of this cruel and bloody war. Should there never be any socialist and labor interbelligent conference during the war, the efforts already made will not be in vain. It is the assertion of the reality of human interests transcending state boundaries, that is the indispensable condition of any vital League of Nations, such as we had understood the Federal Council professes to support. We cannot weld intensely nationalistic governments into a League that will have the strength of a rope of sand unless they are compelled by popular opinion to recognize the oneness

of mankind. In this greatest task of our own or perchance of any age is the church to have no part? If so, she need not wonder that her influence will prove immeasurably less than that of socialist and labor organizations. No effort of hers to reassert brotherhood will be in vain, whether or not its immediate result is successful.

Surely American Christians will recognize this fact and act accordingly. The cautious Federal Council is not yet committed to opposition to a Christian Conference. It will doubtless make public its "further information," which ought to remove its fears of the practicability of that which its members surely do not venture to oppose in principle.

Meanwhile the Boston group of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in an admirable leaflet entitled "Is This the Crucial Hour?" makes these four practical suggestions which we heartily endorse:

"1. Pray, in the spirit of Him who prayed that we might all be one.

"2. Create public opinion. Talk with your friends, with church leaders you know, etc.

"3. Write to the Federal Council of Churches, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, urging favorable action on the invitation to the conference.

"4. Get churches, societies, etc., to pass resolutions and send them to the Federal Council."

In the second century, an anonymous Christian wrote: "What the soul is in a body, this the Christians are in the world. . . . The soul is enclosed in the body, and yet itself holdeth the body together; so Christians are kept in the world as in a prison-house, and yet they themselves hold the world together. So great is the office for which God hath appointed them, and which it is not lawful for them to decline."

Are these words to seem to our generation to be other than a bitter satire upon religion? It rests not with a few leaders but with the rank and file of Christians to give the answer.

A Friendly Wish

"I wish you could send sample copies of your magazine to all the ministers of the churches. I believe you would do some good although most of them are reactionary to the core. Though they are supposed to be "leading the good fight"—they stand pat to the teachings of the past—and really aid bad conditions—instead of trying to do away with them. How to remove this blight on civilization, I cannot say—unless perhaps the forces of Labor can accomplish the task, for Labor today is the greatest moral force we have. If *The World Tomorrow* can help to bring a ray of light into our darkness it will be accomplishing wonders."—*From a correspondent.*

By the Way

Exactly who is to blame for the failure of British representatives to attend the recent American Federation of Labor Conference is not quite clear. According to long and unbroken custom, the British Trade Union Congress some time ago appointed fraternal delegates in the persons of Mr. Fred Shaw and Miss Margaret Bondfield, but at the last moment their passports were withheld, but who withheld them and at whose request is not easy to discover. In his cable to Mr. Gompers, Mr. Bowerman, for the Trade Union Congress, blames the American Government. But our newspapers indicate that all the credit should be given to the British. Probably Mr. Lansing and Mr. Lloyd George are merely following the precedent set by those other distinguished lawyers, Messrs. Spenlow and Jorkins.

"I was quite dismayed," says David Copperfield, "by the idea of this terrible Jorkins. . . . If a clerk wanted his salary raised [Mr. Spenlow was always willing], but Mr. Jorkins wouldn't listen to such a proposition. If a client were slow to settle his bill of costs, Mr. Jorkins was resolved to have it paid; and however painful these things might be (and always were) to the feelings of Mr. Spenlow, Mr. Jorkins would have his bond. The heart and hand of the good angel Spenlow would have been always open but for the restraining demon Jorkins. As I have grown older, I think I have had experience of some other houses doing business on the principle of Spenlow & Jorkins!"

Of course there is this to be said of Miss Bondfield—she is a woman, and as every statesman knows, this is no time for women to be traveling about the world. And yet, as Mr. H. G. Wells would put it, Mrs. Pankhurst. . . .

* * *

It is evident that in England Capital and Labor are wide awake to after-the-war opportunities and responsibilities. Here in America, however, it is only capital that is taking long views. Mr. Gompers and his organization have decided that it is not for American Labor to concern itself with problems of reconstruction. "Sufficient unto the day," Mr. Gompers seems to say, "are the wages thereof." As an instance of English capital's new preparedness policy, the following quotation from a recent issue of *The New Statesman* is to the point:

"It must not be thought that our large industrial firms are overlooking the question of after-war trade. Take the case of a huge armaments firm like Vickers, for instance. Quite definite plans have been decided upon with regard to most of the factories, and the most interesting of these is the intention to start the manufacture of sewing machines on an ambitious scale. It is stated that a sewing machine has been evolved which when tentatively placed upon the market, proved an instantaneous success."

May the day be not far distant when all the great gunsmiths of the world will be turning their tanks into tractors, and their cannon into—sewing-machines.

* * *

On the other hand the following quotation from a recent speech of Mr. J. H. Thomas, a member of Parliament, and

Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Men, shows how British Labor is beginning to face the problems of the future:

"In England today there are roughly 5,500,000 people in arms, 3,750,000 occupied in munitions, 2,000,000 employed in other industries connected with war; and so we have more than 11,000,000 men and women engaged exclusively for war purposes. When peace is in sight, thousands and hundreds of thousands of these men and women will be discharged. If millions of men who have gone through the hell of the trenches and have become callous to death are brought back to take their places in a long queue looking for a job, they will say that they will have another 'scrap' to alter this state of things."

* * *

There is a corner of my book-shelves which I call my "T N T" library. Here are all the literary high explosives I can lay my hands on. So far there are only five of them. Like the two ships in Halifax Harbor before the collision, they look harmless enough, but there is that within them that may some day destroy more than a city. England, Germany, Austria, France and our own country each contribute a single volume. First came the characteristically English "Mr. Britling Sees It Through." Next, America with a small book but packed with pity and imagination—a very explosive formula—"The Backwash of War," by Helen La Motte. Then France with Henri Barbusse's mighty "Under Fire." From the enemy countries come the anonymous "German Deserter's War Experiences," and the Austrian Captain Latzko's "Men in War." Can any of my readers suggest other books of this quality? I look forward to a five-foot book-shelf!

* * *

In the fire and storm of all the big drives for war charities abroad there is danger that we may not hear the weaker but no less urgent calls for help that are coming from peace charities at home. One of the most insistent of these is for the work that is being carried on by that famous New York institution, "The House on Henry Street." I have before me a moving appeal for aid. "We need," says Miss Lillian Wald, the head of this great work, "more funds and more nurses, if the children of New York are to be saved." This "Visiting Hospital" at 265 Henry Street, during the month of March alone, cared for 5,885 patients. Its staff of 168 nurses in those thirty-one days, made 30,450 visits. I sometimes wonder whether the time will ever come when we shall see the same genius and passion enlisted for great peace victories as are now devoted so unselfishly to the winning of great war victories. What stirring appeals could be made for the cleaning up of New York's East Side, for the proper feeding of its children and the rebuilding of its homes. Some day these things will be done. In the meantime, we must keep the home fires burning in Henry Street and in a multitude of other institutions, small and great, North and South, East and West, which carry on an indispensable ministry to humanity.

THE ROAD-MENDER.

The Individual versus the State

JOSEPH A. KYLE

"The World Tomorrow" believes that all problems of reconstruction are fundamentally concerned with the relation of the individual to the State or organized society. We publish this stimulating article (a condensation of a sermon sent us by the author) to provoke thought on the part of our readers and discussion in our columns on this vital but too little considered subject.—The Editors.

A FEW years ago—in a study of the trend of the modern drama from Shakespeare's idolization of the individual to the Shavian and Ibsonian emphasis of the social—I had the temerity to tell an audience that we were entering a period of the world's history that was to be hereafter characterized primarily by the disappearance of the individual. I remember now with something of astonishment and dismay the furor that this statement caused. I had pointed out—and defended—the tendency to subordinate the rights of the individual to the welfare of the social whole. At that time this tendency was showing a double front. On the one hand it was taking away from the individual the right to work out his destiny irrespective of the needs of other men and women. And on the other hand it was destroying society's right to sit in stern judgment upon the conduct of the individual—since we were coming to realize that the individual is a product of social conditions, moulded in thought and feeling by the food he eats, the work he performs, the ideas that he draws from his surroundings, and the traits he has inherited from his ancestors.

Not only was this tendency shown by contemporary drama but by the political events and social reforms then occurring in every part of the world. Everywhere social thought was growing by leaps and bounds; Legislatures, Congress, Parliament, and Reichstag were enacting legislation of a distinctly social character. The great work of prison reform—especially the work of Thomas Mott Osborne—marked a shift of criminal responsibility from the shoulders of the convict to that of society itself. To the new way of thinking the criminal was not an indication of deplorable cases of individual wrongness of heart, but rather a symptom of social blunder and social maladjustment. From whatever angle I looked at it—I saw the individual in a rapid process of extinction.

I not only stated this but expressed my pleasure that the process was proceeding so smoothly and rapidly. A number of my hearers took pointed exception to these remarks of mine. They considered it very dangerous doctrine. The tendency I had indicated, they said, was a direct assault upon the basic principles of our present social order and on the American system of government. It was only to be expected that one of my friends should remind me of Emerson's words to the effect that God would take the sun out of the skies if freedom out of man.

What the War Has Done to the Individual

Today that little difference of opinion seems much like ancient history. And now this strange paradox arises. I have parted company with these friends because they have followed wholesale the point of view I then held, and I have become converted to something of what they believed at that time. War has intervened and, to a certain extent for each of us, has made white appear black and black white. I am no longer concerned as to the repression of the individual—I am wondering whether we are not on the point of seeing his total extinction. Here and there a few frantic voices are raised against the process that is going on so rapidly—but almost invariably they come, not from the ranks of the old individualists, but from the champions of the social point of view. The socialists of today are gulping down a rather peppery dose of their own medicine. They are commanded to bow, body and soul, to the will of the social group. Before the war there were thousands of men and women in this country who were in open sympathy with the socialist party (I was one of them), but who never allied themselves with that party through a deep rooted fear of the tyranny of its organization. And lo! behold the

tyranny of social thought is upon us and the triumph of socialism is still to seek. If we could draw off to a little distance and look at this complete turn over—it would be, to the cynic at any rate,—a highly amusing spectacle.

Centuries of educational work could not have done as much in this line as one year of war. In one year—mark! not a thousand years, but one year!—the social interpretation of life has gone “over the top” and mastered the old individualism. Over against the will of society no man can call his body or his soul his own. The individual has not a leg left to stand on. Once he was much like a centipede—a hundred legs to support him. He could do much as he pleased—and society could go hang!—so long as he did not trample upon the sacred right of another individual to do as *he* pleased.

But today there is no such thing as an individual right. No man has a word to say as to the disposition of his life—he must give it—whether willingly or not does not matter—if the social group needs it, whether he lives in England, or France, or America, or Germany. No man can choose what work he desires to do—he must work as the social good demands. Even that ancient and honorable right of the rich man to loaf has been taken away. Nor can he direct the manner in which his wealth shall be used—the government may take or leave it as it sees fit. The individual has passed out of existence. His religion, his conscience, his soul, have been mobilized, and stand ready to take orders from the will of the majority of his fellow-men. Even a man’s thoughts are not his own. If he dares hold views other than those held by the group of which he is a part—and any Paul Pry has a suspicion of their existence—he is branded as a traitor and an outcast among men.

Thus does the long-heralded social revolution make its appearance among us—for the effectiveness of such methods will not be abandoned with the coming of peace. The revolution in Russia has been more dramatic and more spectacular—but I wonder if we are not plunging as speedily, if not as wildly, away from our old moorings: the right and the responsibility of the individual man and woman.

Is this new revolution a blessing or is it a curse? I look upon it, on the whole, as a blessing. It is the inevitable prelude to the coming of that new

world for which we all pray, wherein there shall be justice between man and man. To fight against the social tendency is futile. We might well adjust ourselves to it, for out of it shall come great good for the mass of men and women.

But after saying so much, and admitting so much—I dig my heels in, lean backward, and seriously question the wisdom of this rush from one extreme to the other. This social victory is on the whole good—but I ask, if there ought not be some limit set to this wholesale destruction of the individual.

“The Conquering Majority”

In speaking of the dead, or the dying, it is proper to recall such virtues as he possessed when in the full vigor of manhood. The individual who is now departing from our midst had some virtues worth dwelling upon. John Knox spoke of him as the conquering majority when he stood alone with God. Is not that the truth? Ever it has been the individual over against the mass of men—but winning because he was right and they were wrong. He was the Moses that led a feeble, hesitating, ignorant slave population out of Egypt and gave them a table of laws that the world has not yet wholly broken away from. He was the fiery mouth of God in the person of Amos denouncing the sins of the priests and nobles of long ago. He was Isaiah and Jeremiah standing out in sublime contrast to the will of fellow countrymen. He was Jesus accepting death on the cross rather than take the conventional interpretation of the kingdom of God. He was the early Christian missionary resigning ease and comfort and braving death in the arena in order to convert a hostile world to a higher conception of life. He was Savonarola, Huss, Luther, Socinus, Roger Williams, Channing, Parker, Garrison, Emerson. He was Socrates, Aristotle, Copernicus, Galileo, Bruno, Columbus, Darwin, Huxley, Spencer. . . . I wonder if the world has ever gained a moral, spiritual, or intellectual victory where it has not been an individual pitted against the will of the great mass of mankind? By this token may we not seriously question any great moral endeavor when it is enthusiastically endorsed by millions of men and women?

If the individual is not to disappear completely

from our midst the only hope for him lies in conscience,—however we may see fit to explain the origin or the character of conscience. Against the will of the social group no other plea has a right to stand. We must grant freely the right of the social group over everything outside the soul of man. Neither property nor human affection nor political affiliation nor the desire to live in quiet and peace have a right to separate men from the duties laid upon them by the society of which they are a part. It is in religion—in some conception of the Eternal speaking in the heart and mind of the individual—that the lonely course can in righteousness be pursued.

I recall the story that Theodore Parker tells of his boyhood experience with a turtle. A boy of nine, he had seized a stick with which to crush a turtle sunning itself on the river bank. As he raised the stick to strike, something stayed his arm and a voice spoke to him saying that it was wrong to strike the helpless creature. Frightened, he ran home to his mother and repeated what had happened. His mother told the youthful Theodore that he had heard what most people call the voice of conscience, but what she liked to call the voice of God speaking in the soul of man. And she urged him to heed its voice always and at any cost, for neglected it would grow less and less distinct and finally cease to speak altogether.

Conscience is the sole stay of the individual in a time of social crisis—but, like everything else, its voice is sometimes uncertain and changeable. It is with sanity of mind and humility of spirit that the voice of conscience must be consulted in such a time, when millions of other men and women of consecration and high purpose find themselves driven to exactly the opposite conceptions of duty. But none-the-less if the voice of conscience refuses to be silenced and speaks with firmness as the very voice of God—there is no other course than for the human to become by the help of a God an individual standing alone and apart from his fellows. Fortunately or unfortunately, few are the men and women who have such a cross laid upon them. God alone can help them bear it. The Eternal is their refuge.

The Government Recognizes the Individual Conscience

Since writing the above I have rejoiced to read of the somewhat tardy but none-the-less welcome

decision of the American government to respect the right of the conscientious objector to refuse to perform military service in any shape or form. With what joy every true lover of America and of humanity reads of this decision. It places us as a people in proud isolation from the high-handed methods with which the German Imperial Government persists in riding over every scruple of conscience. It is one of the decisions in this critical time that we shall later point back to with the greatest of pride. The moral test of any government is its attitude toward the men and women who condemn its conduct—especially when it believes itself to be acting as the God-chosen defender of humanity. The men concerned in this case may be wrong—millions of their fellow-citizens are convinced that they are absolutely wrong—but they are not cowards nor are they shirkers. For the sake of conscience they have voluntarily accepted insult, degradation, severe prison sentences, and even the stern threat of death rather than do what their conscience has held to be wrong. It is to the credit of our government that it has at last made this just decision.

I bow in shame that no such lofty word as is spoken in this governmental order has so far sounded from the national assemblies of any of the great religious bodies of America other than the Friends. Particularly strong is my feeling of shame at the silence of my own denomination, which the American Unitarian officials in Boston have for years arrogantly claimed to represent the church of the free spirit in America. Once again is the old story repeated. The lofty word in behalf of the freedom of the spirit is spoken by laymen and not by the ordained ministers of God.

We shall never return to the old days of rampant individualism. The conduct of the individual must be made to tally with the needs and aims of the social whole. That will be the greatest victory of the war—the laying of a foundation on which can be built a more durable social state. But in the name of religion and human welfare this one limit must be set to the destruction of the individual. No social group, however large or however small, can justify itself if it minimizes the significance of conscience in directing men's actions. It is the only limitation that I can conceive of as putting any check upon this process we see going forward in our midst by leaps and bounds.

The Infallibility of 5 to 4

By a vote of 5 to 4, the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional the hardly won Federal Child Labor Law. The ground for this decision is that the passage of this law was an unjustifiable extension of the power of Congress over interstate commerce. That is to say, the nation is powerless to protect its own children from exploitation or to do so must find some new and tortuous legal way of escape from the confusion of particularistic legislation by 48 States—and that in the midst of war.

This same Supreme Court has recently made another decision of grave consequence in the industrial field. We quote from *The Survey*, of June 8, John Fitch's statement of the Hitchman case. (The italics are ours):

"In this case an injunction granted by a Federal court in West Virginia, restraining the United Mine Workers from attempting to organize the employees of the Hitchman Coal and Coke Co. was upheld. The basis for the injunction was the fact that *employees of the company have been compelled to sign a contract agreeing that they will not become members of any labor union while in the employ of the company.* The suggestion thus given to the anti-union employers of the country has not been unnoted. Already several employers have adopted the identical language of the Hitchman Coal and Coke Company contract, and have compelled their employees to sign it; thereby, apparently, bringing themselves under the protection of the United States Supreme Court in their efforts to prevent the

unionization of their employees. All that any employer would have to do apparently, in order to bring the whole power of the United States Government to his side in a controversy over unionism would be to secure signatures to such a contract. It is a decision that menaces, to an unusual degree, the program of organization of the unions of this country."

We are eagerly waiting to see whether the court which is so powerful a protector of old ideas of state rights and the sanctity of contracts against modern social ideals, will be equally effective in protecting civil liberties against a passing hysteria. So far no important test case of freedom of speech or of the press has been fairly before the Supreme Court. In the lower courts decisions under the Espionage Act are puzzling and contradictory. Will the Supreme Court stand as clearly for the fundamental rights of discussion as it has stood for outworn nineteenth century economic and legalistic conceptions which obstruct imperative adjustments to modern conditions? In any event it is a significant fact that so respectable a journal as *The New Republic* should declare:

"But if the interpretation of that document (the Constitution) continues to rest with men who fail to exercise the vision of statesmanship the nation will be forced to consider whether the dangers of entrusting to the fallibilities of a handful of judges the destinies of more than one hundred millions of people may not outweigh the value of the court as the ultimate law giver."

Innocent and Guilty

We wonder how many Americans looked at their papers on June 2 without some sense of humiliation. In adjoining columns they bore the news, (1) "Jury Frees Eleven in Prager Lynching—'Nobody Can Say We're Not Loyal Now!' Juror Shouts to Crowd," and (2) "Mrs. Stokes Sentenced to 10-Year Term—Socialist Ordered Imprisoned Under Sedition Act."

In the case of the lynchers whose guilt was virtually admitted, "a wild demonstration" greeted their acquittal. According to the *New York Tribune*,

"a Naval reserve band from the Great Lakes district, which was in town on a recruiting mission, paraded the streets during the evening between lines of cheering people playing 'There'll Be a Hot Time' and 'Where Do We Go From Here?' During a recess earlier in the day, before the jury was instructed, the same band played patriotic airs in the rotunda of the court house."

The only sign of encouragement in all this shameful record is to be found in the general condemnation both of the crime and the acquittal by the press and high officials including Governor Lowden of Illinois.

In the Stokes case we have a woman of deep social passion, sentenced to ten years in a penitentiary for writing that she was not for the Government, because the Government was for

the profiteers. If Mrs. Stokes had waited she might have borrowed the President's own language, both from his Red Cross speech and his address to Congress, for a justifiable denunciation of profiteering by the war. (But it is not always safe to quote the President. The *New York Tribune* thinks it ought to be a crime to quote "The New Freedom" these days, and the newspapers report the arrest of a Non-Partisan League speaker in the Northwest for reading from it!)

Three circumstances give unusual importance to this case of Mrs. Stokes: (1) Judge Van Valkenburgh's charge would seem to make illegal all adverse political criticism of the Government on the ground that such criticism may interfere with recruiting. This is a monstrous doctrine. It is simply gagging free citizens in the name of democracy. We cannot believe such an opinion will stand appeal. (2) The sentence, like that of the Rev. Mr. Waldron in Vermont, is ferocious in comparison, let us say, with the maximum of eight years' imprisonment recently given to the German socialists who last year deliberately organized peace strikes in the munition works. Is it that our inexperience in coercion gives us the cruelty of panic? (3) The passive acquiescence, if not the cordial approval, of large sections of the press and the public in the verdict and sentence bodes ill for the general understanding of the fundamentals of freedom.

The Library

President Wilson and the Moral Aims of the War,
by Frederick Lynch and others

(Fleming H. Revell & Co., New York. 75 cents net.)

In a Day of Social Rebuilding, by Henry Sloane Coffin

Yale Lectures on the Ministry of the Church. (Yale University Press, New Haven. \$1 net.)

These two books have a greater value than their own particular merits because they illustrate the trend of thought within the more progressive sections of the Protestant churches. The first is a collection of editorials and addresses designed to serve as a text book in connection with meetings held under the direction of the National Committee on the Churches and the Moral Aims of the War.

The book is filled with the praise of the President's war aims "which are not only moral in their character—they are Christian." This thesis is not developed in detail but is continually reiterated with chief emphasis on the general idea of a League of Nations. The chapter on "Grounds of Hope in the Present Crisis" by Rev. Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin, is perhaps the most thought provoking. It is an able statement of the position of those who from a Christian point of view find real cause for hope in the present situation. The book as a whole is a refreshing antidote to that self righteous, unintelligent glorification of America and total damnation of Germany which is all too common in our churches. Its fault, even on its chosen ground of aims not methods of war, is its failure to analyze adequately the specific things the Church must do to get ready for the new world order and to give spiritual foundation to a League of Nations. It would be stronger, for example, if it pointed out such things as the necessity for the preservation of civil liberties at home and the value of using the church *now* as an organ of Christian internationalism by supporting the proposal of the Scandinavian churches for a Christian conference of prayer for righteousness and peace.

The second volume, "In a Day of Social Rebuilding," is a book that deserves wide reading, and that not only among parsons. It is well written with a wealth of apt quotation. It is marked by breadth of vision, shrewdness of observation, and a certain quality of wisdom. The radical may find here some reason to modify certain of his indiscriminate charges against the church and its leadership, and the conservative within the church will find much to challenge any complacent satisfaction he may still feel. And yet the present writer was led by the suggestive title to expect more than he found. The strongest chapters deal with what may fairly be called in the best sense of the word the technique of conducting a Christian church. They are filled with valuable suggestions as to worship, parish organization, and pastoral work (e. g. "The Ministry of Worship," "The Ministry of Friendship," etc.) But somehow one finds no real answer to many of the deeper problems of social rebuilding—not even any very acute or informing analysis of them. While there are some courageous statements of the anti-Christian nature of present conditions and certain radical criticisms of the Church, they are carefully balanced by counsels of caution and above all of loyalty to the organization.

(By the way, does Dr. Coffin have as "high" a doctrine of the Church as some of his sentences suggest, or is he "giving a special sanctity to the organization by spelling it with a capital C?") The consequence is a net impression of bewilderment which is so common a result of reading the liberal literature of our time. The contrast with such a book as Dr. Orchard's "The Outlook for Religion" is striking. The latter has a challenging prophetic quality that these lectures lack. There is, however, one outstanding qualification to be made of this criticism. Dr. Coffin is far in advance of most American churchmen in deploring the lack of effort to reestablish relations with fellow Christians in enemy lands, and perhaps the very caution of the book at other points may serve to give weight to this particular suggestion in social rebuilding. N. T.

"The Aims of Labor," by Arthur Henderson, M.P.

"The Restoration of Trade Union Conditions After the War," by Sidney Webb.

(B. W. Huebsch. Each 50 cents net.)

These two little books—indeed they are hardly more than pamphlets—are of great importance to students of the labor movement. "The Aims of Labor," by Arthur Henderson, is a plain, unadorned exposition of the British Labor Party's programs; and it has the special value of including the two memoranda on International Policy and Social Reconstruction. Mr. Webb's brochure, "The Restoration of Trade Union Conditions After the War," is not only valuable for its contents and its constructive statesmanship, but it is an excellent illustration of the vast and unforeseeable changes which the war has brought about. It is perfectly plain that the pledge given by the British Government to restore the suspended Trade Union conditions after the war is quite impossible. The changes which the war has made in the organization and structure of British industry are so profound and far-reaching as to make the pre-war industrial conditions no longer relevant. There is nothing for it, says Mr. Webb, but to grant a "Constitution" to industry which shall not only secure for the worker the substantial advance in status and in industrial conditions that he had, through his unions, made before the war, but shall also establish him in a new relation to industry and to society as a whole. It is interesting to see that Mr. Webb includes in his "Constitution," Mr. Malcolm Sparkes' scheme for "National Industrial Parliaments," composed of representatives of workers and employers, not merely for purposes of conciliation, but for the progressive improvement and development of the various trades in the interests of the public. Mr. Webb gives an extended account of the proposal. The particular interest in this is connected with the fact that Malcolm Sparkes is a Quaker and a Conscientious Objector. Recently he was sentenced to two years' hard labor for his refusal to obey military orders. He was in the midst of his effort to establish an industrial parliament for his own (the building) trade, when he was first arrested, on the ground that this was not "work of national importance," and that, too, after the plan he was trying to realize had virtually been endorsed and adopted by the Parliamentary Committee on Reconstruction.

Secret Diplomacy and the United States Senate

We take the unusual step of publishing the larger part of Senator Borah's speech of June 8th in support of his motion for the open discussion of treaties by the Senate. We do this because the newspapers have given little or no publicity to a peculiarly important and informing discussion of a matter which is of more vital concern to the average individual than are many of his personal affairs. The roots of war require the darkness of secret councils in which to grow and bring forth their evil fruits. Lovers of peace must let in the light under which these roots wither and die. Surely all true Americans cannot better serve posterity than by becoming ardent advocates of the cause which Senator Borah here pleads with so much eloquence and courage. Readers who have access to the "Congressional Record" will find the whole of the debate in the issues of June 8th and 10th. Our own comment upon this matter is to be found on page 156 of this issue of "The World Tomorrow."—THE EDITORS.

On Thursday, June 6, Senator Borah, of Idaho, offered the following amendment to the Senate resolution relating to the limitation of debate: "That all treaties shall be considered and acted upon by the Senate in its open or legislative session, unless four-fifths of the members of the Senate by yea-and-nay vote shall determine to close the doors during the consideration of the particular treaty upon which the vote to close the doors is taken. That this rule shall not be limited to the period of the war." During the debate Senator Borah modified his amendment to provide that two-thirds of the Senate, instead of four-fifths as he originally proposed, might close its doors when treaties were discussed.

An important contribution to the debate was made by Senator Hitchcock, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, when he read a hitherto unpublished letter written by President Wilson to Secretary Lansing on March 12, as follows:

MY DEAR SECRETARY.—I wish you would be kind enough to formulate a careful and conclusive memorandum for the use of the Senate with regard to the enclosed resolution. I take it for granted that you feel as I do, that this is no time to act as the resolution prescribes, and certainly when I pronounced for open diplomacy I meant, not that there should be no private discussion of delicate matters, but that no secret agreements of any sort should be entered into, and that all international relations when fixed should be open, above-board and explicit.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Senator Borah's amendment was lost by 50 votes to 23.

Senator Borah Opens the Debate

Mr. President, there is a story associated with the treaty of 1871 between France and Germany which throws much light upon the methods of secret diplomacy. France was anxious to secure a retrocession of Belfort, an Alsatian fortress. One of the French plenipotentiaries was a shrewd, persevering man of business, a student of human nature, by the name of Pouyer-Quertier. The representatives of the great powers had sat late into the night. Bismarck finally announced that he was desirous of retiring and made ready to go. But Pouyer-Quertier insisted upon another bottle of wine, and Bismarck finally yielded. Before the bottle was finished Belfort had been receded to France.

For nearly three centuries in secret chambers in the midst of conviviality and for reasons wholly disassociated with the interest or welfare of the people concerned, peoples and nations have been handed about. The question which is now engaging the attention of practically the entire civilized world is how long that system can prevail, how long shall it be permitted to be the method by which international affairs shall be adjusted, and the rights, fortunes, and lives of the peoples determined? Will the world in the face of this awful catastrophe ever again permit the interests and relations of nations to be determined without full knowledge to those who must meet with all they have the crisis when it comes?

A Challenge to the Senate

It is against this policy of secret diplomacy that the United States has raised its voice through its President, and it is the question upon which the Senate will now be called upon to pass. The most pronounced step that can be taken in addition to anything which has been said or done, or any step which has been taken, is that of the Senate with reference to the subject matter covered by this proposed amendment. There can be no mistake as to the attitude of this body should it fail to incorporate in its rules at this time a principle which will be an advanced step in the matter of open diplomacy. Under our form of government and the manner and method of making and concluding treaties the attitude of the Senate becomes important, and it will be distinctly announced by the position which it takes at this time. . . .

MR. HITCHCOCK: Will the Senator define a little more exactly what he means by "open diplomacy" and by "secret diplomacy." Does he mean to stand as an advocate of entire publicity in the negotiation of treaties or does he mean to advocate simply that the discussion in connection with the ratification of treaties shall be public? Is it not a fact that a large part of the evil of so-called secret diplomacy as existing in the past is that many treaties were not only made in secret but were kept secret after once made?

MR. BORAH: That is a very distinct and pronounced evil which has its foundation in the other proposition that they are first made in secrecy. It is less an evil to keep in secrecy a concluded treaty than to negotiate it in secret; when it has once become binding it is too late for the people's voice to be heard with effect. I will say to the Senator that it is not very material to a people to have the publication of a treaty if its entire negotiation has been carried on in secrecy up to the point where they are bound by it as a nation. If the powers operating in secrecy proceed to the point where the treaty has become valid and binding, there is not much consolation to the people in knowing what it is after it has reached the point where their mouths are closed and they are estopped as a practical matter from any proceeding whatever. Therefore, to begin with, we must have open discussion of the treaties before they are concluded and before they become binding upon the nations which are interested in the particular treaties.

I would be perfectly willing to concede what I presume the Senator is driving at, that there may be some steps in the negotiations between the negotiating parties which at times ought to be treated in secret; I am willing to assume that for the sake of the argument; but the secrecy never should extend to the point where the policy of a nation may be determined

prior to open, full discussion and consideration upon the part of the treaty-making power. A treaty which establishes the policy or political course of a people ought to be open in its consideration from the very beginning. While evils may be conjured up in fancy with reference to the open consideration of the negotiation in some stages of it, those evils, in my judgment, are infinitely less than the evils which flow from secrecy.

The First Item in the President's Peace Program

I was about to say that the Executive, the other branch of the treaty-making power of the Government, had defined the position which it holds with reference to this matter. The President, in his address to Congress on January 8, 1918, said that the first item of the only possible program of the world's peace was—

Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

There is no limitation upon that, Mr. President, as to open negotiation, consideration, or discussion. In view of the fact that it is a statement made by that part of the Government which would be more likely than the Senate of the United States to be called upon to act in secrecy in the origin of the proceedings, I take it that for the purpose of this discussion we can accept the President's view as to what constitutes open diplomacy. In any event his statement is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject. It is one about which men have been thinking and writing, and upon which much has been said during the last 10 years. Many of the statements with reference to the evils of secret diplomacy come from those who have had much to do with the subject and who have given a vast amount of study to the subject at close range.

The *London Daily News*, in an editorial shortly before the commencement of the war, said:

Can Europe ever again tolerate the appalling peril of secret diplomacy? It belongs to the traditions of autocratic and personal government; it has no place in a democratic world.

That was a statement made before the most pronounced evil of secret diplomacy with which the world is familiar had been exposed to men, to wit, the present war. I do not contend, as has been often stated by men more familiar with the subject than I, that every war in Europe for the last hundred years can be traced to the evil consequences of secret diplomacy. But I do say, without hesitancy, that every war in Europe for the last hundred years has had, as a contributing and impelling cause, the evils of secret diplomacy. I think, furthermore, no man can study the history of the present war, its origin and cause, without coming to the conclusion that it had its origin almost wholly and exclusively in secret diplomacy.

Open Diplomacy Would Have Averted the War.

Had the consideration of these questions, even after the ultimatum to Serbia, been conducted in the open, before the entire world, with the sunlight of publicity beating in upon those people who were fomenting war and speculating in the lives of nations, the war would, I believe, have been averted. When we now reflect upon the visit of Lord Haldane to Germany, for instance, prior to the beginning of this war, and the action upon the part of the representatives of the several Governments, the dishonest, sinister scheming of the dynasty of Germany playing under cover of secrecy, one can but conclude that this hellish

conflict could have its birth nowhere outside of secrecy and darkness; the open light of day would have exposed it to premature death—secrecy is always the handmaiden of crime. . . .

The *London Times*, in an editorial in 1912, said:

Who, then, makes war? The answer is to be found in the chancelleries of Europe among the men who have too long played with human lives as pawns in a game of chess, who have become so enmeshed in formulae and the jargon of diplomacy that they have ceased to be conscious of the poignant realities with which they trifle and thus war will continue to be made until the great masses who are the sport of professional schemers and dreamers say the word which shall bring not eternal peace—for that is impossible—but a determination that war shall be fought only in a just and righteous and vital cause.

Mr. President, this war did not have its origin among the peoples of any country. There was no passion coming up from the great mass of those who must fight and die in this war demanding the war. There was no familiarity with facts which enabled them even to have an opinion upon the matter. They moved up to the slaughter pen as thoroughly dumb driven by the secret diplomatic powers of certain European governments as the dumb brute goes to the shambles. There was not a note in Europe among the masses of the people anywhere favoring war. There was not a discordant passion among those now in battle line in Europe anywhere for this war. Those upon whom the burden falls entertained no enmity toward those whom they are now slaughtering. They were brought to the clash by the power which has been permitted for 300 years to carry on its schemes and its ambitions behind closed doors and to tie its peoples by obligations and schemes with which the peoples had nothing to do. The greatest war of all history was begun not to preserve liberty, but to destroy it, and the scheme was hatched in the chancelleries of Europe. While these secret agents schemed the people toiled on in fancied security, without hatred or passion, until the secret conspiracy turned loose its dogs of war "in obedience to a barren diplomatic formula."

So I say, sir, that there has not been announced in this great controversy a proposition which goes more thoroughly to the heart of the controversy than the proposition which the President announced, that a prerequisite to any permanent peace is that hereafter no such thing shall happen; that hereafter the people shall be consulted; and the only way in which they can be consulted is by their knowing the different steps which their representatives take from day to day and month to month and year to year in their relations with other nations. Without realizing this as one of the fruits of the war, we can never enjoy real security. . . .

I can conceive of no matter of more importance to the people, with which they should be more familiar, than that of their relationship to the other nations. In this country we submit almost every conceivable complex question to the masses of the people, and they act upon it either direct or through their representatives. Almost every conceivable problem goes to them in some way through their elections—questions which are more complicated, more complex, and more difficult of solution than most international questions, and yet not so much depends upon their solution. The very life of the Nation, all their energy, their means, material and otherwise, are at the call of the Nation when the hour comes; and if there is any one question with which they should be familiar it is that which involves all they have. Domestic questions affect them seri-

ously enough, but only proportionately to the seriousness of their relationship to other nations. . . .

Of course, all we can do is to deal with our own affairs. . . . There is no binding relationship between this Government and any other until this body passes upon it; that is, in the way of a treaty. There is no treaty relationship, it makes no difference what negotiations have been had between the Secretary of State and other powers in Europe, until it is sent here to the representatives of the people and ratified; it is not binding upon our country. If we declare for an open session with reference to these treaties, the people will always be informed before their Nation is bound by the terms of the treaty and whether or not they desire to sustain it or to have its approval. Of course, we can have no effect upon the European situation except a moral effect. But our part of the work is an important part, and it is quite essential that it, above all others, be in the open, for if the consideration of the treaty is in the open it forces publicity on all previous matters.

The People of Europe Are Demanding Democratic Control

I will say to the Senator, however, that the propaganda for open diplomacy in Europe is widespread and seems to extend to every country of Europe. The people are determined that they will never enter another war, if they can have their way about it, which they have not themselves had anything to do with originating, and with which they were not in sympathy when it starts, simply to carry out the agreement which had been made in secret by their representatives. In my humble judgment that applies also to the mass of the German people, if they are ever released from the grip of the dynastic power of the Hohenzollerns. . . .

Shall we, the Senate of the United States, say for its moral effect in Europe and for its binding effect in this country that the people shall be permitted to pass upon the negotiations which result in binding the Nation or in controversies between different nations with whom we may come into an understanding hereafter? Is not it acting on the side of reason, of justice, of peace to declare our position on this vital matter? It may be argued that we ourselves are not liable to suffer because of treaties made in secret; but let us not withhold our influence in advancing the cause throughout the world.

It is a simple question whether the Senate is willing to take the only step that it can take in encouragement of this movement. What will be the moral effect if we do not take it? What will be the construction put on our attitude throughout Europe if we refuse to take it? This body, which shares the power to make treaties, to conclude them, and without which no treaty can be made, should not go upon record in favor of concluding its treaties and obligations behind closed doors, not alone because of our interest in our own country but because of our interest in the people who will continue to suffer if we do not succeed in breaking down the system. . . .

Mr. HITCHCOCK: . . . any treaty when once ratified becomes public in this country. The chief vice of secret diplomacy in the Old World was keeping agreements secret so that they were not known and have not come to the knowledge of the people. Is not that a fact?

Treaties Are Published When It Is Too Late

Mr. BORAH: Treaties are made public here after they are

ratified, ordinarily; but may I ask the Senator from Nebraska what does it avail the people to get knowledge of the contract after it has been concluded and is binding upon them? Suppose we should make a treaty here and now with reference to Colombia and it would be distasteful entirely to the American people. After it was made and made public, what could they do about it? Suppose the treaty should be made in such terms that it would finally result in war with some South American country. Suppose we should write into the treaty with Colombia a clause which gave Colombia a particular advantage, a particular favor with reference to the Panama Canal, and after it was revealed the South American country should demand that it should be abrogated and the Congress should refuse to abrogate it, and they, by reason of that fact, should declare war, and we would call upon the American people to support it. They would support a contract if it was their Government's contract, although they might have been entirely opposed to it in the beginning.

Mr. FALL: There is exactly a clause such as the Senator has referred to in the pending treaty with Colombia.

Mr. KING: The Senator has in mind, doubtless, the Jay treaty, which was negotiated at an early date between our Nation and Great Britain. If that treaty had been submitted to the people, if they had known of the terms of that treaty, it would not have received the support of 25 per cent of the people of the United States. But after the treaty was negotiated we were bound by it, and our Nation was compelled to ratify its terms and to carry it into effect.

Mr. WATSON: The Senator from Idaho stated that at the time we entered this war in his judgment the people of the United States were not familiar with the causes of the war. Yet the representative body, Congress, may declare war. Now, the people were bound by that and accepted it. Why does not the same situation obtain with reference to a treaty? The people are not informed, as a rule, as to a treaty or as to the ratification of a treaty. The Senate ratifies a treaty and the people have to accept it.

Mr. BORAH: In the first place, as a matter of procedure, there is a vast difference between a treaty which comes in here and may be discussed from day to day in the open and is finally rejected and a declaration of war which comes in a great exigency when there is no alternative. The declaration of war generally results by reason of the diplomatic or treaty relations which have preceded it. If we are going to inform the people so that they may pass upon this matter, they ought to be informed with reference to those negotiations which lead up to the treaty.

Mr. WATSON: I understand that the point the Senator is making is that the people must be informed. I am arguing that it is just as essential that the people be informed of a declaration of war that plunges us into war as that they shall be informed as to a treaty that shall be concluded as the result of the war.

Mr. BORAH: The people were informed in the sense in which the Senator is now speaking, because the President came before Congress and informed us of our position. It then went to the House and was there discussed and came here and was discussed. The only sense in which this country was not informed was the fact that the matter came with such precipitancy there was no opportunity for the people to discuss it among them-

selves, but, in so far as their agents acted openly, they were given all the information which they could possibly have, because everything was had in the open.

Now, it is entirely different with reference to treaties. We give them nothing, we do not state the reasons for the treaty, we do not state the contents of the treaty, we do not permit them to have any judgment in regard to the matter until it is binding, and the treaty may be the sole cause of the war. . . .

An English M. P. Denounces Secret Diplomacy

But you might just as well argue in favor of a secret declaration of war as to argue in favor of a secret consideration of a treaty which may result in war. In the debate which took place in the English Parliament a short time ago I read a paragraph from Mr. Trevelyan, who said—I call attention to this, Mr. President, to show that this discussion at this time is world-wide, and that the Congress of the United States can hardly take a backward step or refuse to take a forward step:

At the same time the House of Commons has shown an appreciation that there is a new era approaching, and that the men and women of this country are going to take a more active and critical part in politics. . . . I am firmly convinced that during this war among many changes of opinion that have occurred there is, perhaps, no change of opinion so decisive as this, that our people now feel that self-government and democracy are unreal boasts, are empty phrases, if they are not applied with the same completeness to foreign policy as they are, and have been, to home policy.

There, Mr. President, in my judgment, is a succinct statement of the entire controversy. There can be no such thing as a democracy in the true sense of the word, as a rule of the people in any proper sense of the phrase if the matters which involve their foreign relationships are not as clearly understood and debated and considered by them as are the matters which deal with their domestic affairs. The matters which enter more directly into their very lives are the matters which are withheld from them; the matters concerning which they could endure secrecy are submitted to them; but when there is a controversy with a foreign power, which may involve much more than the amount of revenue which you are going to raise or the amount of tariff which you are going to impose it is withheld. Mr. Trevelyan says:

During the early months of this war the Government then in office reversed the traditional policy of this country with regard to Constantinople. There may or may not have been good reasons for altering that policy. It was done without the knowledge of Parliament and without the knowledge of the country. The Government pledged this country to secure Constantinople for the Czar as a prize of war.

There is one of the late examples of secret diplomacy. Right here in the very midst of this war, fought for democracy and for the rights of the people, two great nations enter into an understanding that they will sacrifice money and life for a territorial advantage, and the whole thing is withheld from those who are called to the battle field to die. The great cause of liberty, of civilization, is pulled down by secret diplomacy to the dead level of a real estate deal.

With whom was the negotiation made? It was made between the powers of England and the Czar of Russia—the representative of the bureaucracy of Russia. And by whom was the Czar of Russia controlled? The Czar of Russia was controlled by the ignorant, unlettered, lascivious imposter, Rasputin. Late developments indicate that the negotiations with foreign powers were shaped largely by this depraved and repulsive creature, who had taken possession of the Court of Russia, and

behind closed doors played with the lives and fortunes of the Russian people and the people of Europe generally like pawns upon a chessboard.

Shall the Senate of the United States put its seal of approval upon such transactions by saying that we, too, will bind our people if it is within our power to do it, and notify them after the contract has been made? As this member of Parliament very well says, there is no such thing as democracy; it is a false phrase, unless the people are permitted to pass upon that for which they may be called upon to suffer and to die. He continues:

For 18 months they refused to give the House of Commons any information. At the conclusion of that time the arrangement was revealed to the world by the then Russian premier. Shortly afterwards occurred the Russian revolution. It then became apparent that the Russian people did not approve of the policy at all, but that it had been done in their name by the unscrupulous ministers who surrounded the Czar during his régime. I do not know why that arrangement with Russia about Constantinople should have been concealed from this house and the country for any reason except fear of their disapproval, and I am personally convinced—I may be wrong—that if there had been a foreign affairs committee, before whom the principal acts of policy had to be placed before they were realized, that agreement, in fact, would never have been arrived at with Russia.

So, Mr. President, we see that the discussion is going on elsewhere; the movement is going forward in other countries, and we are simply keeping pace by our declaration in regard to this with that movement, which is world-wide. Its evils are upon every hand. There is not a boy leaving his country home under the American flag and going forward now to offer all he has upon the battle fields of Europe who is not to a very great extent a victim of secret diplomacy. The conspiring ministers of Europe brought about a condition of affairs which compelled the United States to fight or give up its liberty, because the scheme behind closed doors was to destroy human liberty.

European and American Methods of Secret Diplomacy

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Mr. President, is it not a fact, and is it not a part of American history, that treaties which have become unsatisfactory to the American people and to public opinion have been denounced and set aside?

Mr. BORAH: If the Senator speaks with reference to all treaties which have been made by the United States, I do not agree with that at all. That has been true with reference to some treaties. For instance, the treaty with Russia was annulled or set aside, because it became very unsatisfactory to the large portion of our people, who are growing now more powerful all the time, and just prior to the election of 1912 both parties declared in favor of annulling it. But if a people are fit to pass upon a treaty after it is made and cause it to be annulled, they are equally capable of passing upon it while it is being made, and the latter course may often save friction and misunderstandings. It is a serious question to annul a treaty once made, and a wise government will not pursue a course which drives a people to that extraordinary and dangerous course. . . .

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Idaho would draw some distinction between the method by which secret treaties are made in Europe, and which produce wars in Europe, and the process by which treaties are made in the United States by the President and submitted to the Senate

for ratification—a process which does not exist in the countries of Europe. There treaties are made by the monarch and ratified by him and submitted to no one else for ratification.

Mr. BORAH: Well, Mr. President, it does not make a particle of difference, so far as the question of secrecy is concerned, whether there are two parties engaged in a treaty or one party, if in both cases the proceedings are secret. If the President of the United States must come to the Senate of the United States for his ratification, and the Senate of the United States remains a secret power, it does not make any difference whether the treaty is made by one or by two secret powers when they have both kept the secret.

It is true that the powers in Europe make their treaties without the ratification of Parliament; but if the Parliament of the United States, or the Senate of the United States, participates as a secret body with reference to that matter, what difference does it matter whether the treaty is made by one or by two powers?

Mr. HITCHCOCK: The Senator's position is that it is not possible to trust the Senate of the United States, representing every State in the Union and bound immediately to publish the treaty when ratified; and he treats that ratification as similar to a ratification by a ministry of the King, when that ministry can consider the treaty is a secret document. It seems to me there is a vast distinction between the two.

Mr. BORAH: Mr. President, I really do not think, with all my respect for the Senate of the United States, that, if it were a secret body on all public questions it would be many generations before it would be as corrupt as all other secret bodies come in time to be. Every secret governmental agency tends to become irresponsible, selfish, and corrupt, and while we are Americans we are human. While I am perfectly willing to concede all my countrymen will ask, and that is that they are a peculiarly virtuous people, in all the ancient meaning of that word, yet I believe, nevertheless, they could not withstand the influence which finally corrupts and controls a secretly controlled legislative body. The Congress of the United States would become just as corrupt and just as venal in course of time, if it were a secret body, as the other secret bodies of the world have which have followed the same course.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator once more. The ministry of the king is selected by the king himself. The Senate of the United States is an elective body, chosen by the people to represent them in the making of treaties, which is one of its constitutional powers. The Senate possesses the power at any time to consider treaties in the open, and on a number of occasions since the Senator from Idaho has been here and since I have been here it has taken that course. Why, under these circumstances, bind the Senate to a rule that it must consider all treaties in the open, when it now has the power to consider them in the open?

Mr. BORAH: It is true that ministers represent the king, and there are no secrets supposedly between the ministers and the king. We represent the people, and there should be no secrets between us and those whom we represent. We are here in a representative capacity; we are not ambassadors from the different States; we are the representatives of the people. Upon what possible theory can the Senator from Nebraska argue that there should be complete secrecy between him and

the man whom he represents and whose agent he is? The people pay the taxes; they fight the battles; they bear the burdens, and upon what theory can we withhold from them these matters which are of prime concern to them? Is it because they are not sufficiently intelligent to comprehend them? Is it because they have not the capacity to deal with them? Will the Senate of the United States take the position that the American people have not the intelligence to pass upon those matters which involve life and death to their country? Upon what theory do we withhold the facts? We are their representatives, their agents, and nothing more.

What Are "Delicate Questions"?

Mr. BRANDEGEE: If the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion there, I have not considered that the reason the Senate had a rule which provided for the consideration of treaties with foreign nations in secret session was because the Senate distrusted those who elected them, or because Senators thought they were anything but representatives of the people, but it was because the relations of different foreign countries to each other are frequently involved in the discussion of a treaty that we are to ratify with one of them, and that, with the delicate situations existing between foreign sovereignties, for all of those things to be dragged into the open on the floor of the United States Senate and discussed might do damage in certain directions both to our interests and to our friends abroad, which might be avoided if they were discussed behind closed doors. It never entered my head that in voting to consider a proposed treaty with a foreign nation behind closed doors we were doing it because we thought the American people were unfit to know what we were about. I may be mistaken about that, but the Senator asked upon what theory closed doors should be advocated, and that is the theory that I had supposed to exist.

Mr. BORAH: What are these delicate questions which may offend foreign powers? These delicate questions are too often questions of dubious righteousness. . . . I take it that they are such questions that if they were thrown open to the public, the public might say or do something which would offend some power in Europe. Not if the powers of Europe desire peace and honorable relationships. . . .

Mr. OWEN: I merely wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that if the so-called "delicate questions" had been made public in Europe this war would have been prevented before it ever had an opportunity to begin, and that the "delicate questions" which arose when the Bolshevik foreign minister published the agreements between the entente allies were highly disconcerting because they ought not to have been made and because they proposed to hand about sovereignties without consulting the people who were involved. Those are some "delicate questions" that ought to be made public both for our sake, for the sake of the allies, and for the sake of the civilization of this earth. . . .

Mr. BORAH: These "delicate questions" are rather indelicate suggestions to the effect that foreign affairs are too high up in the scale of intellectual effort for the consideration of the people. All public questions were once too delicate for the people, and in some countries of Europe, particularly in Germany, it is still so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE: I would agree entirely with the Senator if open discussion did not also involve letting the people of every

other country in the world know all about it.

Mr. BORAH: What question has arisen with reference to any treaty in which the United States has been interested since the Jay treaty up to the present time that it would not have been well for the people of all Europe to have known about? Look back over the history of our treaties, their negotiation, their terms, and what finally became of them, and what question has arisen with reference to these treaties in the last hundred and odd years which the whole world could not have known about and been better off if they had known about it, and what question has arisen upon which the American people could not have passed with intelligence? . . .

Shall It Be a Peoples' Peace or a Diplomats' Peace?

Mr. President, when this conflict shall have closed—no one can foretell that happy day—but when war shall cease and a scourged and weary people begin to assume again the avocations and duties of peace, some of the most vital of human problems will come up for consideration—problems whose solution will take form in treaties to be ratified by this body. There will be first the peace treaty, upon which we are to build our hopes for permanent security, for a durable peace. It will have to do with our welfare and happiness as a people, our life as a Nation for years and perhaps for centuries. Certainly no one will contend that that treaty or any part of the negotiations should be considered in secret. Certainly no one will contend that those who have fought the fight and made the sacrifice, who in future years are to bend under the fearful debt the war will impose, and finally through their energy and deprivations pay it, will not be entitled to know every step from the first to the consummation. Certainly no man will stand in the Senate and invoke secrecy upon that scene made possible by the blood and the offerings of the people. Certainly no one will contend that there are "delicate matters" here, too delicate for the inspection and approval or disapproval of those who are to make the treaty possible. Will this body dare to put its seal of approval upon any treaty not considered and discussed in the open and before all whose efforts have made it possible to have a treaty. It would be a rank and cowardly insult to the dead, a shameful betrayal of the living.

Along with the treaty of peace will come other propositions, propositions which will reach down and take hold upon the very foundations of our national being and, if certain courses are adopted, may change the whole drift of our national life. We will likely be called upon then as a people, as a Nation, to pass upon the question of whether we will depart from the advice of the Father of his Country to enter into no permanent alliance with European powers or whether we shall hold fast to the faith which has guided us through the first century. I am not going to discuss the merits of this question now; my views, for what they are worth, are known to my colleagues here, and the vicissitudes of war have not changed them. But certainly that policy which bears the stamp of approval of Washington and Jefferson, which enabled us to steer through the unexplored sea upon which we launched our frail bark in 1789, and without which, in my judgment, the story of this Republic would have been a short-lived one, will not be changed behind closed doors. . . .

Another phase of the same subject is presented in the propo-

sition of a league to enforce peace—a league which it is hoped all nations will join. Neither do I discuss the merits of this proposition at this time.

I only point out its tremendous import, its almost stupendous possibilities for change in our national life. Some think it would make for peace, some think it would turn this Republic into an armed camp. It seems to me clear enough the changes wrought by such a course will be such as to make us a different political structure. We will necessarily take upon ourselves the race questions, the political jealousies, the troubles of tortured Europe. Some think we would be able to compose them and make for permanent peace. Others think, and with them stands the judgment of the fathers, that it would only draw us into the maelstrom of European politics. Only experience can fathom the troubled waters of that boundless sea. Will this, too, be considered in secret? Will alliances and treaties be made and confirmed for such a momentous course in secret? Will those matters upon which hang the happiness of the living and the countless generations to come be disposed of as "delicate problems"—too delicate for the people to understand or to pass upon, but not too delicate, perchance, to require limb and life in their support?

Mr. President, in the face of the superb courage, the sublime and willing sacrifice of the people in behalf of this civilization of ours, in the presence of this fearful catastrophe from whose destruction if we are to be saved at all we are to be saved by the people—the man in the street, in the factory, on the farm, in the professions—will men still contend that these same people are not entitled to know every act and deed of their public servants to the end that their sanity, their love of peace, their sense of justice, may help to clarify and make wholesome the relations which nations are henceforth to bear toward one another? People who suffer and die as our people are doing in the great cause of civilization can be trusted in every hour of every emergency which is to mark, as we hope, the onward progress of this Republic.

Who's Who Among our Contributors

RUFUS M. JONES is professor of philosophy at Haverford College, Pennsylvania, and a widely known member of the Society of Friends.

DAVID STARR JORDAN is president-emeritus of Leland Stanford University, California. He is a distinguished scientist and speaks with knowledge and authority on international questions.

JOSEPH A. KYLE is minister of Unity Church at Brooklyn, New York.

The World Tomorrow

is published by The Fellowship Press, Incorporated (at 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.), established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued, not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

The Fellowship Press, Inc.; Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevins Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of *The World Tomorrow*: Norman M. Thomas, Managing Editor; Edward W. Evans, Harold A. Hatch, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Richard Roberts, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward, and Walter G. Fuller, Secretary.

Contributions to *The World Tomorrow* should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope if reply is desired.

The World Tomorrow is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy annual subscription one dollar. Orders for copies, subscriptions and all correspondence should be sent to *The World Tomorrow* at the Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

"The policy of reconciliation has not failed; it has not been tried"

says **WALTER E. WEYL**

in his notable new book

The End of the War

PRICE \$2.00

Do you think?

Are you thinking about RECONSTRUCTION?

Send for a list of books on this vital subject.

THE BOOK HOUSE

At 17 North  State Street
The Stevens Bldg Chicago, Illinois

THE RECORD OF A QUAKER CONSCIENCE CYRUS PRINGLE'S DIARY

With an Introduction by **RUFUS M. JONES**



HIS little book is the personal diary of a young Quaker who was drafted for service in the Union Army in 1863. It tells in a simple, appealing way the experiences of Cyrus Pringle as he followed his hard path of duty. All through the record, a fine and sensitive character is revealed, recalling at times that which comes to light in the Journal of John Woolman.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

May be obtained Price \$.60 Post Free from
THE FELLOWSHIP PRESS
118 East 28th Street, New York City

The Works of Rufus M. Jones

Studies in Mystical Religion.....	\$3.00
The Quakers in the American Colonies.....	3.00
Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries.....	3.00
The Inner Life.....	1.00
St. Paul the Hero.....	1.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK

Never Mind What You Think About the I. W. W.

they are at least entitled to a fair trial and an open-minded public hearing. That is a primary American right.

110 of their leaders are now before the federal court at Chicago charged with conspiring to obstruct the war. But the trial involves essentially the activities of the I. W. W. as a labor organization.

The I. W. W. are entitled to the best legal defense they can make. They must bring scores of witnesses long distances. The trial will probably last months.

The Department of Justice, the Court and the jury can be relied upon to deal effectually with any criminal acts that may be disclosed. It is for American liberals to make it financially possible for the defense to present fully the industrial evils underlying the I. W. W. revolt against intolerable conditions of labor.

Such a labor trial is of necessity enormously expensive. It will cost over \$100,000. Of this, about \$50,000 has already been raised from the membership alone. But it is impossible to raise the entire fund from the members.

The whole sum needed cannot be secured without the liberal financial support of those Americans who believe in the right of a fair trial, even for the I. W. W.

The undersigned therefore appeal to all liberals for financial help. Checks should be made out to Albert DeSilver, Treasurer, 2 West 13th Street, New York City.

Robert W. Bruere	Inez Haynes Irwin
John Dewey	Helen Keller
John A. Fitch	Jas. Harvey Robinson
Percy Stickney Grant	Thorstein Veblen
Carlton J. H. Hayes	George P. West
Walter E. Weyl	

Further information about the issues of the trial can be secured in two pamphlets—"The Truth About the I. W. W." with the essential facts in relation to the present trial, together with a reprint from the New York Evening Post of Robert Bruere's articles on the war-time activities of the I. W. W., will be sent on receipt of 10c. Address Room 710, 2 West 13th Street New York City.

When the war is over
the world will have to begin
life over again, and the sooner we
get used to the idea the better.

One of these days the thunder of the great
guns will die away and quiet will return to
the torn and troubled lands of the world—
and then?

What kind of world is it going to be?

How and after what pattern are we going
to rebuild our ruined house?

Shall we drift back to the old round of
national self-interest, crooked diplomacy,
real politik with its gospel of blood and
iron, of the exploitation of the weak by the
strong, and let it all run its devious and
dubious course to another inferno perhaps
deeper and more fiery than this in which
we are caught today?

Or is there some other way?

If so, what is it?

These are the questions

The World Tomorrow

is seeking to answer.

Will you join us in the quest?

We need your fullest co-operation.

If you are not already a sub-
scriber, fill out the accom-
panying form and mail to
us today.

To the
FELLOW-
SHIP PRESS
118 E. 28th St.
New York City

Please send me
"The World To-
morrow" for one
year, beginning with
the number.
I enclose \$1.00.

Name.....

Address.....

I shall be glad to receive..... sample
copies of "The World Tomorrow" for use
in making it more widely known among
those likely to be interested.

THE WILLIAMS PRINTING COMPANY, NEW YORK

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

The Public is the great Non-
partisan Liberal Interpreter. It
interprets for its readers the de-
velopments of the day in Wash-
ington and in the European cen-
ters, where history is being made
—and always with relation to
their bearing on democracy. Its
editorial staff is intent on get-
ting the facts and presenting
them in their true significance.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION
26 WEEKS, ONLY \$1

THE PUBLIC, 122 E. 37th St., N. Y.

CLERGYMAN—FELLOWSHIP MEMBER

will take a few boys to tutor for
the year beginning in September;
country; home influence. Refer-
ences given and required. Ad-
dress 28 Carteret Street, Newark,
N. J.



With the hot sun beating down on their
frail underfed bodies—with no hope of
relief in sight—the little children and
tired mothers of the slums are facing an-
other grim summer in their empty lives.

Help Us Give These Unfortunates A Chance for Health

Sea Breeze—the Association's fresh air home—
gives the one chance for rest, nourishment and
care for many of these families each year—but
help is needed at once if we are to provide for
the long waiting list.

Will you give—just a
little? Allow 60 cents a
day or \$4.00 a week for
each one whom you
will send as your guest.

The New York Association
for Improving the Condition
of the Poor
105 East 22nd Street
Room 250 New York

Please



George
Blagden,
A. I. C. P.,
105 E. 22d St.,
New York

Enclosed is \$.....
with which you are
to give fresh air relief
to the most needy cases.

Name.....
Address.....

APR 15 1918

THE COMING PEACE

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. I. No. 10

OCTOBER, 1918

10 Cents

The Lure of the Disinherited

Richard Roberts

Surfeit and Famine

A. J. Muste

An Exemplar of the New France

Newton Ben Knapp

An Unpopular Patriot

Henry J. Cadbury

Signs of the Times

President Wilson, Internationalist—Is it the Turning of the Tide?—Destructive of Our Morale—How the Facts Must Look to the Germans—The Plain Man's Peace Principles—A League of Nations, Real or Illusory?—The School Year Begins

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street

New York, New York

The World To-morrow

Contents of the October Number

The Coming Peace.....	235
Signs of the Times.....	236
The Lure of the Disinherited, by RICHARD ROBERTS	240
The War Department and Hav- erford College	244
Seeking Christian Unity.....	245
Industrial Democracy or Pa- ternalism	246
An Exemplar of the New France, by NEWTON BEN KNAPP.....	247
The Riddle That Is Russia.....	250
By the Way.....	251
Surfeit and Famine, by A. J. MUSTE	253
Prisons and Men.....	255
The Open Forum.....	256
An Unpopular Patriot, by HENRY J. CADBURY	258
The Library	262

YOUNG WOMAN, assistant to ad-
vertising manager of New York pub-
lishing house, wishes position with
opportunity for advancement. Present
duties including writing of ads, pub-
licity notes, catalogue descriptions;
proofreading; supervising of all de-
partment details; stenography and
typewriting; has also had experience
in retail book business. Address 49
Oxford Avenue, Richmond Hill, N. Y.

The Public

A Journal of Democracy

The Public is the great Non-
partisan Liberal Interpreter. It
interprets for its readers the de-
velopments of the day in Wash-
ington and in the European cen-
ters, where history is being made
—and always with relation to
their bearing on democracy. Its
editorial staff is intent on get-
ting the facts and presenting
them in their true significance.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION
26 WEEKS, ONLY \$1
THE PUBLIC, 122 E. 37th St., N. Y.

THE BOOK OF THE YEAR IRELAND

A STUDY IN NATIONALISM

By
FRANCIS HACKETT

"The Irish question"—long distorted and misunderstood, is here stated with clarity and eloquence. Prejudice and hatred have ever obscured the issues; this book will inform the seeker after truth, guide those charged with responsibility and confound the enemies of real democracy. Americans may now judge the case on its merits.

Causes, consequences and remedies are presented; the various aspects of the problem—economic, religious and nation-
alistic—Ulster, Sinn Fein, the Church, are disclosed in true perspective. The government, the education, the agriculture and commerce of Ireland, past and present, pass before the reader. The book, in a word, is the answer to the Irish question.

\$2.00 (weight 2 lbs.)

LETTERS & LEADERSHIP

By
VAN WYCK BROOKS

Has our idealism broken down? Are we the victims of commercial-
ism? Is Young America spiritually anarchistic? Is our creative
life sapped by an economic system that makes our criticism a fail-
ure? What is lacking in our thinking and in our thinkers?

The author answers these questions in a provocative work that
presents an American ideal and indicates the path that leads to it.

\$1.00 (weight 1 lb.)

The AIMS of LABOUR

By
ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

"Probably the most epoch-marking if not epoch-making document
that has ever been given to the world, not excepting the Magna
Charta, or the Declaration of Independence. Never, indeed, since
the greatest labor-leader of all ages issued his manifesto to the
rulers of Egypt on behalf of the oppressed Israelites, have the
privileged classes been addressed in terms so peremptory and un-
mistakable and in language so well adapted to their understanding."
—ALEXANDER MACKENDRICK in *The Public*.

\$1.00 (weight 1 lb.)

Good booksellers can supply you immediately. If you
prefer buying of the publisher books will be sent c. o. d.
unless you remit (including parcel post charge) with
order. Weights are given so you may send the exact cost.



B. W. HUEBSCH
225 Fifth Avenue NEW YORK



The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. I. No. 10

OCTOBER, 1918

10 Cents

The Coming Peace

THE other day *The New York Times* let out its own private dove of peace for an experimental flutter. The Bird of Freedom happened to be abroad at the time, and in no sweet temper; and the poor dove was driven somewhat incontinently to cover. Altogether a curious piece of tragi-comedy.

But it is possible that here as elsewhere "things are not what they seem." We shall not join the company of wiseacres who profess to know the secret of the *Times'* startling escapade. Perhaps we need only suppose that someone at the editorial offices has his ears to the ground and thinks he hears the premonitory tremors of the approach of peace. He may not be far wrong. It is becoming daily more evident that serious peace transactions are coming within the range of practical politics. To exercise a careful judgment upon the Austrian peace note, the sobered temper of German statesmen, the armistice with Bulgaria, and the political significance of the recent operations in the Balkans and in Syria is to gain a definite impression that the brazen heavens are cracking. The *Times'* dove may make better practice next time.

The great danger of the present time is that peace may take us unawares and we be unprepared for it. The naive and unreflective spirits who propose to impose peace at Berlin are, of course, not to be taken seriously. They evidently (to begin with) are unacquainted with the map of Europe; they are certainly unaware that victory in modern warfare (despite the German obsession) is *not an affair of getting to this place or that*; and finally, they seem to assume that Germany is not to be allowed to surrender on any terms this side of Berlin. We suspect that events will bring a sad disillusionment to these unsophisticated souls.

But the advocacy of what is popularly called

a "dictated" peace is more dangerous because it is now evident that such a peace is possible. It would indeed be enormously costly; and it is questionable whether the European Allies could afford to pay the price. Still such a peace is possible. But whether it is likely to be the kind of peace the world needs is another question. It would be difficult to conceive of a "dictated" peace providing any guarantee of future immunity from war, unless it were an unthinkably generous peace. On the other hand, to suppose it possible so to cripple a nation of sixty million people as to render them incapable in perpetuity of threatening the peace of the world, if they had a mind to do so, is fantastic nonsense. It is questionable whether this policy would secure peace for a single generation. The President's Liberty Loan speech proves that he looks upon the course of events with too much historical realism to be a party to so fatal a course.

The main political problem at the moment is to discover the true criterion of victory. To some, apparently, that is no victory which does not bring with it the power to impose crippling and humiliating terms on Germany. From the standpoint of international economics, this would be folly; from the standpoint of the ultimate aim of the war, it would be a blunder and a crime. It would make Germany sorry for herself and not for her sins, and that makes all the difference between a vengeful, embittered Germany and a penitent Germany. *It all depends upon whether we want a triumph for our power or a triumph for our principles.* To achieve a triumph for our power without achieving a triumph for our principles would be simply to be *defeated on the main issue.* The peace we need, and the peace which must be made if the principles laid down by the

President are to be established is that which will bring a chastened and democratised Germany into the League of Nations. That were indeed a transcendent victory.

But such a peace must at last be a negotiated peace. It is difficult to see how the President could have returned to the Austrian peace note an answer other than he did. But the question is not whether there shall be negotiations or not; it is rather under what conditions and upon what basis they shall be conducted. It is clear that negotiations would be a farce which did not begin with certain definite guarantees of good faith. On the one hand, the evacuation and restoration of Belgium, northern France and Serbia, the de-

nunciation of the Brest-Litovsk and the Roumanian treaties are clearly necessary preliminaries of fruitful negotiation; and on the other hand the Allied nations should similarly disclaim, as the President has virtually invited them to do, the intention of retaining permanently for themselves the enemy territories which they now occupy. These matters belong to the region of statecraft; and they are full of pitfalls for the untutored layman. Yet it requires no diplomatic *finesse* to see that the real test of the coming peace will be whether it makes a real and effectual League of Nations possible; and that a "dictated" peace in the sense popularly given to the term today is the last thing on earth that will do so. R.

Signs of the Times—an Editorial Survey

President Wilson, Internationalist

The date of our going to press makes it impossible for us to give extended comment on the President's remarkable speech in opening the Fourth Liberty Loan Campaign. But we cannot issue this magazine without recording our profound gratification for this lofty statement of the issues of the war and the conditions of peace. The President's whole speech is at once the expression of the noblest desires of "plain men" and an appeal to the moral sentiment of mankind for the guaranty of righteous peace. Its far-reaching implications are too many for us to discuss here, but one point stands out clear above all others: it is the keynote of the whole address—internationalism.

"... national purposes have fallen more and more into the background, and the common purpose of enlightened mankind has taken their place."

The public statement of this fact by the head of a great nation, is itself a most hopeful step towards securing that unity of purpose and counsel which Mr. Wilson demands. By this speech President Wilson brings the League of Nations into the forefront of practical politics. In his five detailed requirements as to relations within the League of Nations, we venture to think he will carry the great majority of the people of all the Allied nations with him. Only such conditions as President Wilson here lays down will prevent the growth of any nationalistic ambition which would strangle the new internationalism at its birth. In a League of Nations inspired by the passion for justice expressed in this address, is emancipation for mankind, the promise of an end to the dreadful night of international anarchy, and the herald of a new day.

By Way of Explanation

An explanation is due our readers for the lateness of the arrival of their copies of the September issue. The simple facts of the case are as follows: Immediately on publication the issue was held up in the New York Post Office and the question of its mailability under the terms of the Espionage Act was referred to the Hon. William H. Lamar, Solicitor General of the Post

Office Department. We took the matter up in Washington, and on September 16th were notified that the issue was non-mailable. Two days later, however, we received another communication from the New York Post Office authorities stating that "instructions have been received from the Department to despatch this issue in the mails and that the copies held have accordingly been despatched."

As a result of this order of release our readers received their copies a few days later.

Is It the Turning of the Tide?

On September 18 the *New York Nation*, which had been held up by the Post Office under the Espionage Act, presumably for an article criticizing Mr. Gompers, was also accepted for mailing under orders from Washington, and we have recently received several back numbers of *Unity*, which had been held up for several weeks in the Chicago Post Office.

Is it too much to hope that the indignities of the so-called "slacker round up" in New York, which were so bitterly denounced in the Senate (and in large measure repudiated by Attorney General Gregory), and the attempted suppression of *The Nation* set the high-water mark of the bureaucratic flood which has all but submerged our civil liberties? At any rate, we still have confidence in the President's desire to save alive something of the old American freedom. It is heartening to read the *New York World's* vigorous denunciation of the Post Office for its attack upon *The Nation*. If papers of the power of *The World* will apply the same reasoning to the whole field of thought, radical as well as liberal, the new day may be dawning sooner than we had hoped.

Destructive of the National Morale

Against this more hopeful view of the revival of the belief in civil liberties is the conviction of Eugene Debs in the Federal Court of Cleveland, Ohio, and his sentence to ten years in

prison, a sentence apparently generally approved by dominant public opinion. The case is now under appeal. We are entirely willing to admit what indeed Mr. Debs himself has acknowledged—namely, that the District Attorney, the Judge and the jury all did what they felt was their duty under the letter of the Espionage law, as it has been interpreted in previous cases.

We hold no brief for the soundness of all of Mr. Debs' statements in the speech for which he was arrested. Indeed, we have not seen a full account of them. But Mr. Debs is a man of unusual sincerity and courageous devotion to freedom. As *The New Republic* says, he cannot be accused of "malignance toward his country or desire for its defeat."

To put a man of his character in jail does far more to injure the national morale than any speeches he might make, and the fact that a law exists which makes it almost inevitable for judge and jury to convict him is a humiliation to America. We by no means agree with *The New Republic* that the issue in question is primarily one of a more discreet use of "the Government's net." That issue is indeed involved in this case, but our main concern is that a liberty-loving people should ever have intrusted any Government whatsoever with a law so drastic that the honest criticism of a high-minded man should bring him face to face with a long jail sentence. Unless a people retains its liberty to discuss freely according to conscience, it loses its soul. It is entirely possible to enact wise economic legislation which will make for general prosperity and still leave men a race of helots. No military victories whatsoever can make the world safe for democracy until free men learn, not to fear, but to trust thought and discussion as guides to truth.

How the Facts Must Look to the Germans

The dramatic change in the posture of affairs which has been effected during the summer of 1918 is striking enough, yet we doubt if American exultation is an adequate measure of German depression. Consider the case: In the spring of this year—indeed up to the battle of Chateau Thierry in July—German hopes for victory were by no means unreasonable. Though the people as a whole were doubtless weary of war, and thoughtful citizens were deploring the terrible moral effects of what *Vorwärts* called "the bath of steel," and though food and other materials were scarce, Paris and the channel ports seemed very near, and pride of victory is no mean stay for weary hearts and empty stomachs. But what a change in three short months! Now winter is approaching. All the German gains since March have gone for naught. In the last two months the German Army has lost probably 600,000 men, including 185,000 prisoners, and irreplaceable supplies. America with her men and ships has done that which the Supreme War Lord is reported to have contemptuously pronounced impossible. In eighteen months almost 2,000,000 Americans have landed in France, men whose fresh vigor and high morale have given not only physical aid but contagious spirit to the Allied troops in Foch's masterly offensive, and officers whose leadership in handling great bodies of troops in large scale fighting has triumphantly met the test of St. Mihiel. On top of these German reverses in the west comes news of the Turkish disaster in Palestine, and now Bulgaria's unconditional surrender. These are staggering blows to Ger-

many's dreams of eastern empire, and they are made even more disastrous by conditions at home. While her conquest of Russia somewhat relieved Germany's immediate necessities, it did not provide the food her people need. Serious as is her case Germany is far from such a famine as that which will make Russia a graveyard this winter, and in Persia is sending "starving children out to graze in parched fields like cattle." But even a moderate degree of hunger is no sauce to make defeat palatable. No wonder then, that stories reach us of vehement appeals to the German people "to be hard," to hold fast, and to defend the Fatherland.

In short the military and economic situation from the Allied standpoint is so satisfactory as to leave those who have been engrossed hitherto in concern for military operations entirely without excuse for refusing to consider those political conditions which alone will secure our hopes of a clean and enduring peace. It will be an ill service to our own country and to mankind if exultation in our own amazing strength should lead us to adopt a policy which would substitute within the mass of the German people for the insolent courage of victory a desperate courage of despair.

The Plain Man's Peace Principles

The climax of the first stage of the so-called German peace offensive was the Austrian proposal for a secret, non-binding discussion of terms for ending the war. Its prompt rejection by the President removes it from the sphere of practical discussion and clears the way for the next step which Baron Burian (the Austrian Foreign Minister) assures the world will be taken at the suitable time. In the sort of diplomatic game now being played only those behind the scenes can really judge of the wisdom of the next move. We can easily conceive one might be far removed from the position of the "bitter ender" and still—perhaps for that very reason—have taken exactly the President's course in declining *secret* negotiations, entered at the request, not of the major, but of the minor partner in the Alliance which has brought so much woe to mankind.

But if the question of the wisdom of this or that particular move is difficult to discuss without inside information, it is the more important for the plain citizen to keep certain principles clear. It is not enough that the answer to Austria should be an emphatic negative. As the Inter-allied Labor Conference pointed out in the resolutions of September 19:

"It is by defining their own war aims, jointly with the United States, with the same precision and clearness, that the Allied Governments will give to the workers of the world the conviction that they are resolved to continue the struggle, not in order to meet the aggression of the central monarchies by undertaking in their turn a war of conquest, but for the single purpose of establishing on an unassailable foundation a peace which will be just and lasting."

This simple and just requirement the Allied governments have not met after Mr. Wilson's fashion, and until they do so, it may always be possible for the governments of the Central Powers on the one hand to entertain hopes of sowing seeds of dissension among the Allies, and on the other to terrify their own populations by sinister warnings of an Allied imperialism which will make a dictated peace seem even worse than war.

A League of Nations, Real or Illusory?

Even here in America some of our leaders seem in danger of forgetting how largely the President's Fourteen Points constitute the first draft for a new charter of internationalism. To Col. Roosevelt the very word internationalism is anathema. He and Senator Lodge and Representative Fess—mighty Republican chieftains all—demand a peace based exclusively on changes in the map, and guaranteed for ever and ever by America's armed power and good intentions. This is far removed from the internationalism implied in the President's proposal of "a general association of nations," freedom of the seas, reduction in armaments and the removal of economic barriers—proposals on which he based his appeal to the American people for their sanction for war—a sanction given on that basis and no other.

Yet we do not know whether Col. Roosevelt's frank scepticism as to a vital League of Nations is more disquieting than is the strange lack of political realism which runs through much of the discussion that is being carried on by certain liberals as to the plan and working of a League. This vagueness is well illustrated in *The New Republic's* editorial entitled, "Questions for American Conservatives," in the issue of September 21. The writer disposes of Mr. Roosevelt's "glowing statements" easily enough, and is sound in his main contentions. But we are willing to submit to any thoughtful reader this basic question: How can you possibly constitute any adequate League of Nations by mere governmental agreement in the face of all the difficulties which *The New Republic* itself points out, and in opposition to a fierce nationalism intensified by the war, without some deliberate effort being made to create international good feeling? On this crucial point *The New Republic* is silent.

Take the case of Austria-Hungary. So intermingled are hostile nationalities in that "ramshackle empire" that no mere geographic solution is possible. Neither dismemberment nor reform will satisfy unless the great mass of common people, Slav, Magyar and Teutons can come to realize how much they have in common. The masses of all the races under the Hapsburg sway are slaves to the landed aristocracy or to industrial magnates; they all belong to that great company of the disinherited; they have far more to gain by cooperation than by the dominance here of this nation and here of that. Ask any Polish, Magyar, or Slovak immigrant to tell the story of what led him to come to America and you will find almost invariably a tale of restricted opportunity and economic oppression. Yet by some madness he will usually share in the hate of his group for some race which oppresses his own and scorn for some others that he thinks inferior. Though economic reasons largely compelled his emigration, he still thinks of social problems primarily in political terms.¹ And what is peculiarly true of Austria-Hungary is largely true of the whole company of nations. No mere organization of them imposed from above will stand, unless it corresponds to some deep desire of their peoples.

¹ We are informed that a series of conferences at Washington between representatives of Poles, Czecho-Slovaks, Lithuanians and Jugo Slavs is making real progress in clearing away conflicting claims and in creating harmony between these peoples.

The Rock on Which to Build

It is in creating and stimulating the desire of the peoples for unity that the labor movement and the Christian Church should prove invaluable. We know what the labor movement is doing. Every newspaper tells some fragment of the story every day. The Inter-Allied Labor Conference just closed gave the world new hope. Even Mr. Gompers' resolutions as to peace terms were not far removed in spirit from the proposals of Allied labor. Should an inter-belligerent labor conference never come into being, the steps already taken to that end carry us far on the road to world brotherhood. By the same token the failure of the Christian Church to rise to a similar opportunity is cause for the world's sorrow. Yet it is encouraging to see that our distinguished visitor, the Bishop of Oxford, is trying in a cautious and partial way to make us understand the church's opportunity. We hope the largest measure of success will attend his efforts to arouse Christian support irrespective of creedal differences for the great ideal of a new society of nations. Perhaps there may even yet grow up in our own country a movement comparable with the British Council to Promote an International Christian Meeting, whose recent conference at Oxford we report elsewhere in this issue.²

This is the great task of our time—the cultivation of the new world spirit. If some demigod could draw the boundaries of the nations with supernatural skill, the resultant peace would be less to be desired than a more imperfect geographical solution worked out by the nations themselves inspired by a new consciousness of the solidarity of the working class, by the unity of Christian fellowship, by the brotherhood of all humanity, and by a new sense of what may be accomplished by cooperation within a democratic League of Nations.

If *The World Tomorrow* preaches this doctrine with wearisome reiteration, it is because we believe that only its realization will prevent the tragedy of America's undoubted idealism losing its clear vision in an obscurantism which will defeat the one hope for a tolerable world.

The School Year Begins

"The mind of the child is a greater thing than the State, for in it lies the germ of the future and the only source of the security of humanity. Defile it, shame it, cramp it, and calamity must come; but give it the delicate and sweet nurture that it requires, and it will bring forth joy and abundance. The mind of the child is the grain of mustard-seed which can put forth such strength as to move mountains."³

To how many men and women does the coming of autumn bring mingled memories of the varied emotions with which they once looked upon the opening of each school year? Most of us would have to confess that during the primary and grammar grades September was a month marked with mourning on our calendars, and for most of the boys and girls we know it is still Black Monday when they go back to school. Of all Shakespeare's seven ages, the schoolboy is still the most easily recognizable. Wherein lies matter for considerable reflection

² Since writing the above we have learned that an International Christian Conference was held at Upsala on September 8th, but we do not gather that it was a representative meeting.

³ Gilbert Cannan in "Freedom." (F. A. Stokes. New York. \$1.25.)

as to the nature not only of children (especially boys), but of teachers and of the whole school system.

It is a characteristic of our time, and one of its chief grounds for hope, that so much keen thought is now going into this most difficult of all problems in social reconstruction—the remodeling of our whole system of education. From the Montessori movement for little children to the projected college in New York where teachers are to be free from the control of vested interests there has been a great rattling of dry bones and here and there have been signs of the emergence of new and kindlier life.*

Many of the questions of method, the correct correlation of work, study, and play, the conflict—in large degree unnecessary—between vocational and cultural training and between the relative disciplines of science and the classics are still fruitful themes for controversy. But behind these problems lie certain fundamental questions of the aims of education as a social process, of our attitude to children, and of the ideals we shall impart to them—questions which cannot be evaded by any who look for the dawn of the new day. Of our present gross offences against the mind of the child, of our sins against democracy in education, of our denials of the spirit which must be imparted to the children lest the heroic deaths of their fathers shall have been in vain, we cannot now find space to write. We hope to treat some of these grave issues in our pages during the coming months.

But when all is said and done there is hope in the real desire of men and women that their children should be better than themselves—in their pathetic eagerness to have them avoid some of the old mistakes and tragedies. When once parents and teachers and all who touch the lives of the little children come to see how infinitely important is their task; when they realize that upon the children depend all our hopes for brotherhood and cooperation and peace, surely we may expect them to deal with each unformed soul with a kind of passionate reverence; to teach the boys and girls to scorn all fear save the fear of greed and hate and lust, to honor the truth, and to substitute for an evil and false religion of the State, the worship of God and the love of their fellows.

Aside from these great concerns with the spirit of our education we face unusual practical difficulties. Mr. Baruch has denied materials for building new schools in New York because of pressing war needs and doubtless a similar prohibition will be applied in other cities. Only those who have seen the serious effects of over-crowding on teachers and children will understand what this means. A partial solution may be found in the use of church halls and other similar buildings by the school authorities. Churches and other institutions possessing suitable buildings have here opportunity for the noblest kind of patriotic service.

Even more serious is the estimated shortage in teachers in the United States which has been placed as high as 27,000. School teaching is less picturesque and romantic than some of the war service which our unformed and ununiformed young women render so eagerly and capably. It is, to say the least, not less important. As a speaker recently put the matter, "will the

cherished daughters of comfortable homes take to themselves this appeal for service?" No victory is secure if to win we have to sacrifice the children.

The Need for Infinite Pity

The fact that the United States is by all odds the richest and least war-weary nation in the world, places upon her an enormous burden. First of all there is the burden of the vigorous prosecution of the war. There is no need to dwell on the cheerfulness and courage with which the nation has assumed that burden, both in men and money. The new Revenue Bill, which provides for raising by taxation sums that would once have been deemed incredible, will shortly reach the President after a minimum of opposition. The fourth Liberty Loan will be raised, and after that the united drives of the Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus and other war agencies will not fail of generous response.

But this does not exhaust the claims upon Americans. The inspiration for this paragraph is found in a copy of a cable from Mr. Caldwell, the American Minister to Persia, which has just reached our office: "Forty thousand Christian refugees from Urumia, Persia, have passed Bijar en route Hamadan, and are followed by forty thousand more. Epidemics and hunger cause many deaths."

This is only one of the many heartbreaking appeals that have come to the Armenian and Syrian Relief Committee. That Committee cannot organize a great drive, nor does it wish in any way to rival the claims of the Red Cross and other agencies upon our generosity, but there is no relief work which more truly deserves continuing support. Americans who are exploring the possibilities of generous giving cannot fail to find some place for aid to the Armenian and Syrian Relief Committee, whose headquarters are at 1 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Freedom and Fellowship in Reconstruction

The General Conference of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, held near Highland, New York, September 19-22, had deep significance not alone, we believe, for those who were present, but for the future of religion in relation to the vital problems of Reconstruction. Here were gathered nearly two hundred people of diverse backgrounds and many different points of view, but yet united in what was, in the highest sense, a spiritual unity, by their passionate desire to reconstruct life according to those principles of love, of fellowship and of freedom which find their highest expression in Jesus of Nazareth.

The general theme of the Conference was freedom and fellowship as conditions for the development of personality and Christian democracy. This problem was discussed, keeping the facts of the present time as a background, with relation to education in home and school, to economic conditions, to race relationships, to the state, and to the relations between nations.

It is not possible here to give an adequate account of the proceedings, but the writer of these lines cannot refrain from acknowledging his own debt to the Conference for the new sense it has given him of the place of religion in life, of the possibility of combining strong convictions with tolerance, and of the power of men and women to arrive at truth by frank discussion in friendly fellowship.

* None of these new ventures in education gives greater promise than the projected Fellowship School in England, which will open this autumn. See *The World Tomorrow* (page 144, June issue).

The Lure of the Disinherited

RICHARD ROBERTS

ONE of these days some one perchance will write for us a book on the psychology of the rebel with the patience and the vast knowledge which went to the making of Baron von Hügel's monumental account of the psychology of the mystic.* The interest of such a work would be far from being merely academic. It should have an immediately and intensely practical interest for the sociologist. Indeed, it may be urged with some plausibility, that the psychology of the rebel is the neglected factor in modern sociology. We have not solved the problems of society in a world of advancing experience and endless adventure when we have described ideal machinery of social control. For we have yet to consider how a society may hold together and still give the prophet adequate elbow room. Hitherto we have devised no means of dealing with the moral pioneer save those which we apply to the criminal. We stone or hang or shoot him. Yet the plain fact remains that with the exception of a few constructive statesmen here and there, the significant figures in history are the great rebels. Is human nature so defective that it cannot cohere into a society in some manner which should save it from branding as an outlaw the man who sees visions and dreams dreams? To his contemporaries, because he assails the established order, he is a disruptive and dangerous fellow. He troubles Israel and therefore must be done away with. Yet the thing he fought and died for becomes incorporated in the social tradition of the generation following. Is it impossible to get the good out of him without abusing and maltreating and killing him? Must he always be driven into opposition? Obviously the long history of resistance to authority is a study of the first importance for the complete sociologist. It is not, indeed, inconceivable that the sociological master-key may be found in that quarter.

But is there a distinctive "rebel" psychology? Let any one read consecutively a few "rebel" biographies, selected at random, and he will be left in no doubt about the answer. The type varies endlessly in detail; but the type itself is

unmistakable. It is of course a misuse of language to give the name to any Tom, Dick or Harry who from inordinate self-esteem or inborn "cussedness" is always "'ag'in' the government," or who likes to pose as a social eccentric. A shallow judgment may be satisfied to trace the rebel temperament to a native and selfish impatience of social restraint; but the rebel proper is never an unruly egotist predisposed by nature to kick against authority. It is not a case for facile generalization but for a subtle and patient analysis. That is a task plainly beyond the limits of an occasional paper; but the main business of this present writing requires that a rough sketch of the rebel mind—such as any one might make after a cursory reading of a few obvious "lives"—should be attempted.

I

The charge of madness has almost invariably been made against the rebel by his contemporaries. This is not to be ascribed only to prejudice. Most rebels display certain abnormal mental characters which lend some color to the charge. Rousseau was the prey of an excessive sensibility which actually in his later life—as his treatment of Hume especially shows—brought on an acute mental derangement. The case of Blake is notorious. Shelley was unquestionably subject to hallucinations—the alleged murderous attempts upon him at Keswick and Tremado are not on the evidence to be taken seriously. Rousseau, Blake and Shelley all alike, sometime or another in their lives, believed themselves the objects of concerted persecution or boycott. Pascal is said to have fallen—on at least one occasion—into a trance; and not a few of the great rebels have seen "visions." The plea of insanity was seriously made at John Brown's trial and urged with some seeming plausibility. Swinburne was notoriously erratic. His fits of ungovernable fury, his wild "rites of incantation" before the portraits of Mazzini and Orsini betray an unstable mentality; while Lafcadio Hearn impressed his friends as "being slightly off his balance." The story of Nietzsche's madness is universally known.

* "The Mystical Elements of Religion," by Baron F. von Hügel.

The roots of this condition are to be sought partly in the rebel's heredity. There had been repeated instances of insanity in John Brown's family on his mother's side, and the strain passed through him to some of his sons. Walt Whitman's youngest brother was an imbecile, his oldest brother died a lunatic. Lafcadio Hearn's Greek mother became insane; and it must have been a singular ancestry that produced not only Lyof but those eccentrics Nicolas and Dmitri Tolstoi. More interesting and perhaps more relevant than the presence of morbid elements in the rebel's heredity is the record of a certain ancestral dislike of authority and contempt of ordered life. Rousseau's father was a restless, highly emotional man, utterly careless of affairs. George Fox's mother was "of the stock of martyrs." Shelley's ancestors, according to Professor Dowden, "were conspicuous for their devotion to falling and desperate causes." A mild history of resistance to authority lies behind Thoreau's life. Swinburne inherited his republicanism and his impatience of restraint "from his turbulent grandfather." The Tolstois numbered among their ancestors Decembrists and political exiles. John Brown's father was long a voluntary agent of the "Underground Railroad." It may also possess significance that Rousseau, Blake, Thoreau, Whitman, Lamennais, and Lafcadio Hearn, were the products of an ancestry of mixed nationality.

However the fact is to be explained, the rebel has commonly been marked by an unusual sensitiveness of mind and consequently he has been prone to strong reactions to appropriate stimuli. But along with this sensitiveness goes generally an abnormal physical restlessness. Rousseau loved a vagabond life.

"While the other great exponents of the eighteenth century, Hume, Voltaire, Diderot were nourishing their natural strength of understanding by the practice and pursuit of literature, Rousseau, the leader of the reaction against that movement, was wandering, a beggar and an outcast, craving the rude fare of the peasant's hut and passing nights in caves and holes in the field or in the great desolate streets of towns."

But he liked the life, and, says Lord Morley, "walked elate and ready to strike the stars." John Brown seemed to be wholly incapable of a settled life beyond the shortest period of time. "That lad," it was said of Swinburne, "is a flame of fire." George Fox in 1643 "started wandering over the country in search of something," and kept wan-

dering to the end of his life. It requires a mind of some agility to keep track of Shelley in his swift and sudden excursions here, there and everywhere, from the time he was expelled from Oxford to the end of his life. Walt Whitman, Lafcadio Hearn also, for long periods of their life, were uneasy spirits incapable of rest. This wanderlust was, however, in no sense the product of an excess of physical energy, for many of the great rebels were men of inferior physique. Its sources are rather to be sought in the mind; and it must be described as the reflex of an intense mental energy which indeed in many cases as in Wyclif, Rousseau, Shelley, Nietzsche, outran the available physical resources.

This combination of acute sensibility with intense mental energy appears to form the basis of the "rebel" temperament. Once a definite impression is made upon such minds they seize upon it passionately and all their mental energy is directed to its service. Sometimes it happens that an event in the rebel's youth gives a definite bias to his mind which develops and acquires an absolute authority over him in the years of adolescence and maturity. It was an early personal experience of injustice that gave that cast to Rousseau's mind which determined his life; there seems to be some evidence that a like circumstance quickened Shelley's life-long opposition to all kinds of tyranny. John Brown has related how the sight in youth of a negro boy of his own age, "badly clothed, poorly fed and lodged in bad lodgings, and beaten before his eyes with iron shovels or anything that came to hand," led him to declare or swear eternal war with slavery. But however the master-idea presents itself, its impact is generally overwhelming. It crowds out the other interests and remains "sole monarch" of the man's mind. It makes him "a man of one idea," like Robert Owen, who, said Leslie Stephen "was one of those intolerable bores who are the salt of earth." Not all rebels are, however, cursed with Robert Owen's prosiness—though they share no less than he in the sense of a definite vocation—not always indeed untouched by a certain exaltation. John Brown once declared that "God had created him to be the deliverer of slaves the same as Moses had delivered the children of Israel." Walt Whitman believed himself entrusted with no mean commission. After speaking of some of the great masters of literature, he

says, "I will be also a master after my own kind, making the forms of emotion as they pass or stay, the forms of freedom, the *exposé* of personality, singing in high tones Democracy and the new World of it through these States." It is not always that the rebel's sense of commission becomes so naively articulate; but it is never wanting. Generally, too, when once the rebel has made the great acceptance, he ascribes to it the authority of an ultimate moral order which cannot be suspended or repealed. The word "conscience" is never off his lips in a time of crisis. He is the bearer of a trust which he dare not betray even though the price of faithfulness be death. "Here I stand," one great rebel said (and all true rebels virtually say it), "I can do no other."

In any complete picture of the rebel, something would have to be said of his fondness for solitude and lonely meditation; of the paradox of his passion for a future which should reproduce some ancient simplicity; of his tendency—once the first step in revolt is taken—to extend his rebellious front to other points; of the frequent admixture of integrity of character with a certain irregularity in conduct; of his courage and his optimism; and of many other things. But for our present purpose we may leave the picture here.

II

Something of the rebel there is in every man; and in youth we all pass through a rebel phase. Only in rare instances, however, does it persist into middle life; still more rarely does it determine a man's permanent habit of life. We become accustomed to the sight of injustice; and use dulls the sharpness of the first perception of the harshness of man to man. The preoccupation of daily business completes the anesthesia. Even in cases where the rebel genius is most pronounced, it frequently fails to materialize into definite and sustained action. Swinburne's republicanism remained a purely academic affair; Lafcadio Hearn after a brief and unfortunate throw at race prejudice, subsided into domesticity. Robert Owen's fine energy was dissipated in futile communistic ventures—"Mr. Owen's parochial parallelograms," as Sidney Smith wittily called them; and he was a forgotten man long before his death. In Nietzsche, the rebel was burned inside out; and he will probably rank at last as the great reaction-

ary. There are plenty of instances, moreover, not only of "village Hampdens" who never arrived at all, but also of Hampdens turned official—the subtlest expedient of authority for taming the rebel.

The development of the rebel requires not only the temperament but the occasion; and it is the character of the occasion which throws the clearest light upon the rebel's mental structure.

Disraeli used to speak of the "two nations" which inhabited England. These were the privileged people and the disinherited. But that is a phenomenon peculiar neither to England nor to the modern world. It is the great permanent line which divides the human race from top to bottom into two classes. We belong either to the exploiting race or the exploited, are either top dogs or under dogs. The Greek cities with all their emphasis upon freedom yet thought of it as the prerogative of the few. "There were vague beginnings of a new ideal in Athens, but even in Athens personal liberty such as is now connected with the word 'democracy' was confined to a very small percentage of the population."* The remainder were women and slaves upon whose subordination the entire social order rested. The line of division has not always been political or economic. In our own time, the acute sense of disinheritance has been the main-spring of the feminist movement. In religion especially the cleavage has been conspicuous. The Reformation controversy about the layman's right to receive the chalice in the Sacrament was at bottom a repudiation of the tradition of a privileged caste; and every considerable reformation of religion has involved a challenge to priestcraft on the part of a disinherited laity.

It is the clear perception of this circumstance—the subordination of that mass which we commonly designate "the people," the appeal of a disinherited class, of "the army of workers," as Lord Morley has said, "who make the most painful sacrifices for the continuous nutrition of the social organization"—which constitutes the decisive factor in shaping the rebel's mind and course of life. It sometimes happens that a combination of circumstances throws the need of the disinherited into sharp relief, and the ensuing ferment creates the leader *ad hoc*, as it were. The dis-

C. D. Burns: *Greek Ideals*, p. 76.

integration of the old feudal bonds in England liberated the social discontent which roused John Ball and made him the inspirer of the Peasants' Revolt. Dr. Lindsay in his "History of the Reformation" tells us of the existence of an active and wide-spread evangelical piety in Germany long before the Reformation, and it was the sharp contrast between the spiritual hunger of the people and the barren externality and corruption of medieval ecclesiasticism, at last brought to a head by Tetzel's peddling of indulgences, that precipitated Luther's crisis and with it the Reformation. The crisis in the early development of Kansas undoubtedly marked a stage in John Brown's development. But whether we may be able or not to trace decisive occasions of this kind in the life of the rebel, the common mark of the rebel mind is a passion for the common people. It has been said of Rousseau that "it was because he had seen the wrongs of the poor not from without but from within, not as a pitying spectator but as of their own company, that he by and by brought such fire to the attack of the old order and changed the blank practice of the older philosophers into a deadly affair of ball and shell." Similarly Professor Dowden says of Shelley that "it was the sufferings of the industrious poor that especially claimed his sympathy; and he thought of publishing for them a series of popular songs which should inspire them with heart and hope."* Tolstoi, according to Romain Rolland, had for the laboring people, a "strange affection, absolutely genuine," which the repeated experiences of his social disillusionings were powerless to shake. Sometimes, as in the case of Glendower, Mazzini and "nationalist" rebels generally, it is not the case of a disinherited class but of an oppressed nation which shapes the rebel's course. The rebel in every case is made by the lure of the disinherited.

But it is not only compassion for the disinherited which moves the rebel, but a profound faith in their power to work out their own salvation. The appeal to the people has been of the essence of rebel policy. The Peasants' Revolt in England was stimulated by John Ball's doggerel verse, which was specially intended to stir discontent. Wyclif, says John Richard Green, "appealed, and

the appeal is memorable as the first of such a kind in our history, to England at large. With an amazing industry, he issued tract after tract in the tongue of the people itself." He wrote "in the rough, clear, homely English" of the ploughman and trader of his day. The Tractarians of a later date were only imitating their great Oxford precursor when they went distributing their tracts from door to door. But Wycliffe did not confine his popular appeal to tracts. His order of "poor preachers" "whose coarse sermons and long russet dress moved the laughter of the clergy—formed a priceless organization for the diffusion of their master's teaching." John Brown addressed his propaganda at an early stage to the negro; and it is hardly doubtful that his hopes chiefly centred at last upon a general rising of negroes in support of his campaign. Long before, John Hus had carried his appeal to the Bohemian people—as Arnould of Port Royal, convicted of Jansenism at the Sorbonne, designed to place his case before the French. Pascal's Provincial Letters were deliberately composed as an appeal from the ecclesiastics to the public. The great emphasis upon public preaching during the Reformation was derived from this same faith in the efficacy of popular appeal. It is sufficiently well known to need no further remark than the reminder that in this way the rebel has made important contributions to the literary as well as the social and religious history of his people.

III

The paradox of the rebel, then, is this, that while he has been assailed as a subverter of social order, his own driving force has been a social sense, quicker and broader than that of his orthodox contemporaries. He attacked the existing social organization only to break down walls that hindered fellowship. He heard the call of the disinherited and it became in his heart a call to lead them into that heritage of opportunity of which they were cheated by the cupidity and cunning of the great. He assailed the Bastilles of constituted authority and battered hoary institutions that the people might—at this point or that—come into their own. He sought to fling out wide the frontiers of privilege that the poor and the outcast might come into a world of larger life.

* Dowden, *Life of Shelley*, p. 437. "The Songs and Poems of the Men of England" were published in 1819, after Shelley's death.

Back, therefore, of all else in the rebel mind we find a mighty social instinct. Historically it is the negative and destructive aspects of his work which receive the greater prominence. But no true rebel is either an iconoclast or a vandal in intention. His destructiveness is merely an incident in the pursuit of a generous constructive purpose of broadening the basis of human fellowship. He is fundamentally a humanist; he is less concerned for institutions than for men; and when institutions are in effect anti-social, they become his special objects of assault. And as long as our social order regards the good of institutions rather than the good of men, so long will there be a voca-

tion for the rebel. It is only the infusion into our social thought and practice of a clear-eyed and energetic humanism that will make the rebel spirit superfluous and divert its fine positive strength into the peaceful service of the community. But while we esteem the state or the church more than personality, institutions more than men, property more than humanity; and while public authority regards the maintenance of vested interests as having a first charge upon its vigilance and thought, we shall still have the rebel with us. But it is as well that we should remember that he is a rebel because he has a nobler social vision than our own.

The War Department and Haverford College

The public is in a general way familiar with the plans for organizing the "S. A. T. C." (Students' Army Training Corps) in the colleges and universities throughout the country. Some of the implications of General Crowder's scheme are made clear in a letter from the Board of Managers to the Patrons of Haverford College, Pennsylvania, which we quote in full:

"The daily press has kept the public informed of the chief features in the War Department's present plans. In brief, the Government proposes for the next nine months to furnish colleges installing a unit of the S. A. T. C. with students of the Government's choosing and to maintain them at Government expense for three, six or nine months, according as they belong in the twenty, nineteen or eighteen year-old class at registration on September 12th. This provision of the Government offers a generous cooperation with the cause of education in this country, for the plan supplies both students and funds. There are some colleges, however, which if they are to maintain their allegiance to their best traditions and principles find themselves unable to participate in these plans by installing a unit of the S. A. T. C. As a college governed by members of the Society of Friends, whose historic convictions with regard to all war are well known, Haverford feels that it must choose other ways of working constructively for the welfare of the nation and the future of society.

"The Government's plan is the outcome of its desire to train and render quickly available the officer material which will be required for the large armies to be placed in Europe in 1919. To this end daily military drills, weekly inspection, barrack life, army mess,—all under orders of a resident military officer whose authority is necessarily supreme—will be introduced. Most notable are the instructions that no time is to be spent by enlisted men upon subjects which have no bearing upon the science of warfare and that such academic subjects as may be approved are to be taught from the standpoint of their utilitarian value in the present emergency. It was made clear at the Plattsburg Conference, September 3-4, that it would be necessary for colleges with a S. A. T. C. to make military instruction their *main* object instead of a *minor* object. Such undergraduate colleges will be for an indefinite time effectively military academies specializing in highly technical studies.

"It should be stated that thus far the Government has

not used any pressure, other than that of the practical advantages mentioned above, to induce our colleges to embrace its plan. At Washington the attitude of Friends is well understood and their loyalty unquestioned. We have the best authority for stating that the War Department is not averse to such colleges as Haverford, which see clearly their course, continuing their thorough training for citizenship and for international service by preserving an academic programme under their own control. We highly appreciate this confidence and we dedicate our efforts as citizens and educators to deserve it. There is a constant demand for teachers and investigators fitted to deal with the many problems confronting the nation requiring other than a military solution. Regardless of the heavy cost involved, we intend to maintain at Haverford this year such a scholarly standard as shall commend our action, taken on conscientious grounds, to all those who cherish the freedom which higher education has always enjoyed in our land under the guarantees of our democracy.

"The statement in the previous letter concerning the academic and athletic programme for the coming year still holds good. The College office is prepared to facilitate the transfer to other institutions of students whose sense of duty calls them elsewhere, and likewise to welcome them again when they are free to resume their education as originally contemplated under Haverford ideals.

The reasons which lie behind the Government's policy can be readily appreciated. That policy is prompted by the logic of war and conscription, and by a desire to conserve under these conditions what can be conserved of higher education for young men. It is conceivable that out of this drastic treatment may ultimately arise certain needed reforms in the spirit and efficiency of our colleges. And yet this militarization of higher education and its regimentation under government control is not without its profound dangers. We believe the future will look back with gratitude to the courageous action of the Managers of Haverford College who, in a spirit of fairness and friendliness, have asserted, at great cost to themselves and their famous institution, their loyalty to truth as they saw the truth. Only by such loyalty can education be made the road of progress, the shining path by which free men tread the way toward God.

Seeking Christian Unity

American Christians who have felt concern at the indifference of our churches to the idea of an International Christian Conference during the war will be interested in the following report of the recent meeting of the British Council to Promote an International Conference. We print below the full story of the Conference as given by that admirable English church weekly, "The Challenge," of August 16, in the hope that from it our readers may find new inspiration for their efforts to persuade their fellow Christians in America to take action in this matter. In the attitude of Christians toward such an International Meeting, is proof of the reality and power of our faith.—The Editors.

A MEMORABLE conference of the British Council to promote an International Christian Meeting was held at St. Hilda's Hall, Oxford, from August 6-9. Mrs. Creighton (widow of the late Bishop of London), presided. The following resolutions were moved by Mr. Frank Lenwood (of the London Missionary Society) and Dr. Hodgkin (of the Society of Friends):

"The Conference has brought into new clearness the purpose of the British Council to Promote an International Christian Meeting, and in view of some misconception it may be well to state that purpose once more.

"In their invitation to the conference the Scandinavian primates write: 'Now, as before, we emphasize the strictly religious and unpolitical character of the conference. The task of this Christian Conference is, without any prejudice to national loyalty, that of manifesting the spiritual unity in Christ of all believers, and to weigh in prayer the duty of the Church to resist the passions of war and to promote that temper which makes for justice and goodwill in the intercourse of nations.'

"In full acceptance of these aims the Oxford Conference would urge that:

"1. There is a great work to be done in prayer; work, indeed, which anyone who accepts the teaching of Jesus Christ must regard as justifying all the effort put forth to secure the International Conference. Where two or three are gathered together in His Name, our Lord will be in the midst. To prayer all things are possible.

"2. There is the work of binding together the broken body of the Church. The first duty of Christians, as followers of our one Lord, is to realise their unity in Him. It is as the Church is herself made one by love that she can best serve to call forth in other spheres of life the goodwill the world needs.

"3. Without attempting to interfere in political action, the International Christian Meeting, which is to be a Conference for prayer, is imperatively needed to create the atmosphere in which diplomatists of goodwill can arrange righteous terms of peace, and the atmosphere in which it may be possible to reorganise society throughout the world upon Christian lines. The creation of this atmosphere is preliminary to, and quite apart from, any action of a political kind."

A Message Worthy of the Christian Church

The second resolution, summing up the conclusions of the Conference, was expressed thus:

"That this Conference expresses its conviction that the Fatherhood of God, which Christ came to reveal to men, involves a fundamental unity in human life, which the Church of Christ should help men everywhere to discover and express in all relationships, personal, social and international. On this

basis, and in humble penitence for past failures and sins, there is hope for the reconciliation even of those who are mostly deeply divided, and in order that she may serve the world there is urgent need that the Church shall in some fuller way realize her international unity and mission at this time when the nations are divided into warring group. To this end the Conference will continue to work for an International Christian Meeting, and appeals to all Christians to do their utmost, while facing all the facts of the present terrible situation, to help to create the spirit in which such a meeting with our brethren in other lands may help us to find our way together to the truth, and to labor in unity for the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth."

The following telegram was received from the Scandinavian primates:

"Scandinavian Christians praying for unity, penitence, reconciliation, righteousness, bless Oxford Conference, through spiritual presence. (Signed) Ostenfeld, Copenhagen; Tandberg, Christiania; Soderblom, Upsala."

The warden of Keble College, Oxford, opened the conference on Unity. He spoke of Christ as the Creative Word, who had called order out of chaos in the beginning and would restore the moral world, shattered now by the war. He is the revelation of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Father Nicolai Velimirovic (of Belgrade) followed. Speaking of the Eastern Church, which regards suffering as the only road to knowledge, he warned us to be in no haste for peace. Christ was crucified in the market-place, in the schools, in the universities, in the churches before the war began. We were learning much through the war. Germany must lose this war, for a victory over the world would be the ruin of her soul. The war aims of the Allies meant not merely the restoration of Belgium and Serbia, but the duty of the strong to the weak, of the rich to the poor.

The session concluded with Intercessions, led by Father Nicolai, who prayed in realization of the spirit of unity for all creation, "for the worms and the serpents, the fields laid desolate, the trees cut down, the beasts which suffered with us; for our friends and enemies; for the humble and the mighty, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor."

In the afternoon Dr. Inge (Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London) spoke on corporate penitence. We must not judge the Germans harshly for their moral insanity now, for we had waged wars in the past with small excuse. He instanced the Crimean and Chinese wars, and asked if the League of Nations would show consideration to the claims of Japan for expansion. Finally, he expressed the conviction that only by individual penitence should we lay the foundation of world peace.

Lord Parmoor followed, offering three choices: (1) perpetual wars; (2) world supremacy for one Power; (3) a League of Nations founded on the principles of Justice and Brotherhood. Already England and the United States share a code of common law, which might be adapted to meet international needs.

Dr. Hodgkin suggested that if we tested our lives by our Master's life we should discover that ignorance was a sin and led to prejudice, from which even the churches were not free. We had shown arrogance toward subject races, rather than the spirit of fellowship. We had failed in the Will to Good.

On the third day of the Conference Dr. Selbie (Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford) opened the morning Conference on Reconciliation, showing the true relation of the churches to the nation. Ninety per cent. are ignorant of the meaning of Christianity. All acknowledge some god now, but the question is, which? Do they worship the Kaiser's god or the god of the profiteer—or the god of those of whom it was said of old "their god is their belly"?

We must go back to Jesus Christ and teach as He taught. We must acknowledge the supremacy of the spiritual above armaments, above wealth. What is the condition on which we may enter the Kingdom of God? We must Obey the Law of Love. We must live the life of love and learn to love our neighbors first. We must teach self-sacrifice, humility, purity, as part of the duty to our neighbor. The social evil should not be treated entirely from the medical point of view; each one must learn to respect the dignity and glory of his neighbor's personality.

Lady Barlow urged the need of reconciliation with those in Germany who are seeking after truth and love. Dr. Hodgkin appealed for courage to risk making mistakes for the spirit of adventure. Mrs. Creighton summed up with the need for reconciliation between old and young, the need for truth—the need to face truth, to learn truth, to teach truth, remembering that Christ is truth and truth alone can unite us.

In the afternoon Dr. Estlin Carpenter (Manchester College, Oxford) spoke on the Christian conception of justice and righteousness. He defined the first as equity, the other as sympathy, charity or love. He quoted Professor von Stengl, who said before the war that Germany must have world power and keep order by force, abolishing international law, and warned us of the danger of winning the war, but being conquered by the spirit of Prussia.

A Representative Conference

Mr. Lenwood and Dr. Hodgkin summed up the ideas discussed in the resolutions already mentioned, definitely welcoming in the name of the Conference the manifesto of the German pastors as a proof that they, too, share our desire for a Kingdom of God founded on brotherhood, justice and righteousness.

The following churches were represented at the Conference: Church of England, Eastern Orthodox Church, Church of Sweden, Dutch Reformed Church, Wesleyan Methodist, Congregational, Primitive Methodist, Unitarian Church, Baptists, Society of Friends.

The inevitable postponement of the International Conference calls for increased and sustained effort rather than any slackening of interest.

Industrial Democracy or Paternalism

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., has given out a glowing account of the success of his plan for improving the working and social conditions of his employees in Colorado. Let us give his conclusions in his own words:

"The outstanding results of the operations of the plan have been as follows:

1. Uninterrupted operation of the plants and increased output.
2. Improved working and living conditions.
3. Frequent and close contact between employes and officers.
4. Elimination of grievances as a disturbing factor.
5. Good-will developed to a high degree.
6. The creation of the community spirit."

It is indeed a far cry from the Ludlow massacre to this idyllic picture. We rejoice in the change and hope that the facts will continue to substantiate Mr. Rockefeller's claims. Yet there is a grave danger that well meaning folk regarding this comfortable state of affairs as the whole solution of our industrial problem, may be aroused too late by a rude awakening. The cure for slavery was abolition, not the conversion of Simon Legree into a kind of genial Big Brother to Uncle Tom. This illustration may seem extreme but the fact remains that the workers will not and should not rest content with welfare work or paternalistic concessions either from their employer or from the state, or even with a carefully guarded share in settling minor disputes. The industrial democracy they seek must bring into question the whole wage system, and the right of men to acquire and administer as their personal property, the land, the mineral wealth of the earth, and the indispensable tools of production. Men everywhere are becoming aware that the acquisition of this kind of property with its enormous powers of control over mankind is not the reward of merit, but is more often a consequence of the accident of birth or of lucky speculation, or of success in soulless competition, and that its administration has on the whole been socially wasteful and selfish.

There is therefore a relatively simple test to apply to Mr. Rockefeller's plan and to many others of its kind. Is it inspired merely by superficial pity, by a liking for the gratitude of one's employees, by a desire for the bigger business to be secured by harmony? Or is it inspired by justice, by an honorable sense of the shame of our present system, by profoundly Christian love and brotherhood? If these higher motives dominate, the employer will frankly recognize his welfare plans not as the goal but only as steps forward. The "charter of rights" he grants will be no concession from above but a recognition of justice long denied, and he will be as eager as his most restless employee to speed the training of himself and his workers through various stages of real copartnership until the day of true industrial democracy dawns at last. "Welfare work" as a means of holding what we more privileged folks possess is a doubtful blessing—may be no blessing at all—but every tentative step on the difficult road to the fulfillment of democracy is clear gain. Only let us all realize that the fulfillment of democracy is utterly inconsistent with the special privileges many of us now enjoy.

An Exemplar of the New France

NEWTON BEN KNAPP

The publication of Romain Rolland's "For the Renewal of Humanity" in our August issue makes us especially glad to be able to give our readers the following appreciation of the great French author. In the days of reconstruction that are drawing nearer and nearer, his spirit will have a wide influence on all who seek for the establishment of international brotherhood on the foundation of justice and love.—The Editors.

SINCE the war broke out the French people have drawn close to the heart of mankind.

At every step they have won our admiration, confidence and affection. To many this revelation of unseen power has come as a complete surprise, but to those few who really knew France it was long foreseen. Professor Giddings, of Columbia University, has for many years expressed his enthusiasm for the intellectual interest he has found in all classes in France, even among the peasants, and has praised the peculiar French quality that marks their products, and their undying idealism, which places the spirit above the flesh. Professor Giddings declares that the French have led all nations during the past century as the most truly cultivated people on the globe.

A conspicuous exemplar of the new France at this moment is Romain Rolland. He is one of the best hated and one of the best loved figures in the world conflict. Daring to be independent, he has brought down upon his head the abuse and slander of a swarm of critics. He has been branded by an influential section of the French press as a pro-German and a traitor. His articles have been dissected and certain lines published with the deliberate intention to mislead. He has been condemned, even in France, without a hearing. Once again the old saying has proved true, "Give me two lines of writing, and I will have the author hanged."

Who is this man, Romain Rolland? What has he said? What is he doing that makes him seem to be such a danger to the liberties of society?

Edmund Gosse, the English critic, has pronounced one of his books, "The noblest work of fiction of the twentieth century." Ellen Key writes of him, "Youth has found in his works a new, free and living source of religion." Another has spoken of him as the real spiritual leader of France, while the Dutch poet and philosopher, Frederick Von Eeden, writes:

"France has had great poets and great novelists, but her greatest glory is in men of unswerving character, of free and proud spirit, the men of purely human quality which surpasses in value to all humanity the artistic and literary gifts. Such a man was Victor Hugo, and after him I know of no one who so closely resembles him as Romain Rolland."

For us in America our chief interest lies in his writings, and in his thought and spirit. From the outset of his career Romain Rolland has been a hero-worshiper. His first books are unsurpassable biographies of such stalwart souls as Tolstoi, Michael Angelo and Beethoven. A few months after the outbreak of war there came from the press the book for which he has suffered the heights of criticism and anguish, "Above the Battle," a book that will always be regarded as one of the strongest contributions of a master hand and a master spirit to supernational love.

An Epic Novel of Humanity

But Romain Rolland's supreme triumph thus far rests in his novel, "Jean Christophe." This epic has already been translated into several languages. In spite of its great length it is being read and reread by thousands. Throughout Europe it is said to be the most eagerly discussed novel of our time. It was awarded the Nobel prize for literature in 1915.

"Jean Christophe" has two great themes. First there is the unfolding of an eternal spirit; a soul of vast potentiality so that the story becomes on the personal side a "great prose epic of passion, buffeted by the waves of circumstance, and moving across the stage which presents in one vast panorama the culture of modern Europe." "It is a man that I am creating," the author explains with justification. "My hero absorbs me . . . I seem to be incarnated in him."

We have, in the second place, a noble effort to reconcile the spirit of France with the spirit

of Germany. Before the war broke out it was said that this novel had done more to bring about an understanding between these two nations than all the plots and plans and banquets of the diplomats. "Jean Christophe" shows its author to be a race-psychologist of rare vision and understanding. As one reads these pages it seems as if he has lived in both these warring countries all his life.

Jean Christophe is the personification of an idealized Germany. Olivier represents the steady, intellectual spirit of France. These two men are necessary complements to each other. They love each other as only the noblest of men can love. In deepest sorrow, in lonely despair, they join hands. The story of their devotion is destined to become a classic expression of a glorified friendship.

About these two central themes Romain Rolland has woven his profoundest observations. Never was there a novel written that is a more complete expression of the author's soul. It is a burning criticism of life, a flaming ideal for the young men of tomorrow.

"I was lonely," he writes. "Like so many in France, I felt myself in a hostile moral world in which it was impossible to breathe. I was stifled. I wanted to protest against this corrupt thought of the so-called elect. I wanted to say to the elect, 'you lie, you don't represent France.' In order to do this, I needed a hero pure of heart and eye, whose well-nigh incorruptible soul should give him the right to speak with a voice which would make itself heard."

Defending His Nation's Soul

Romain Rolland is primarily a musician, being not only a skilled performer himself, but also one of the most original of living critics. He is incurably religious; always does he see a mystic meaning in experience; no matter how sad, it is for him lighted up with a soft radiance from within. His pen is dipped in the light of the stars. Above all things he is sincere. Like Emerson and Whitman, he proclaims the virtue of being frankly one's self. For him the essential of individual happiness and power is the determination at the outset to be freely the voice of one's own soul.

Almost alone of the intellectuals of Europe Romain Rolland has stood steadfast against the sweeping tides of loosened passion. His ideal-

istic spirit has leaped into unison with the calm, pure spirit of the young men of France holding the lines at the front. He has risked everything dear to him because he felt that while others saw it as their duty to defend the nation's frontiers, it was just as clearly his duty to defend his nation's soul.

In a recent letter we catch a glimpse of his staunch, fiery spirit:

"I cannot endure narrow and arrogant nationalism, nor stupid hatred between peoples each of which has its greatness, and its weakness, and is necessary to the others for human progress. I consider that in defending such a cause I am defending that of France, of greater France, and if this attitude brings me injury and hostility I regret it, but I shall not change my attitude in the least. I know that I am doing my duty, and that it will be recognized later when the fanatical delirium which now vexes European brains shall have passed away."

This is the spirit that lives in the pages of "Jean Christophe." The truth must be spoken at the cost of success, happiness, reputation, life and all that humanity holds dear. There is only one tribunal before which every thought, every act is tried—the unswerving judgment of one's own soul.

Romain Rolland is of the opinion that war is the product of governments, not of peoples. In "Above the Battle," he makes the same distinction that President Wilson so staunchly insisted upon in his declaration to Congress on the eve of war; our quarrel is not with the people, but with the nefarious imperial dynasty of Germany. Clothed in the highest idealism, Romain Rolland pictures the young men going forth to battle expressing the heroism of the world. They come with equal simplicity and sincerity from all countries—heroic, earnest, religious, opening a new era in the world, eager to sacrifice their young lives to the dreams of their fathers. Beautiful is his apostrophe to these zealous armies:

"O young men that shed your blood with so generous a joy for the starving earth. O heroism of the world! What a harvest for destruction to reap under the splendid summer sun. Young men of all nations, brought into conflict by a common ideal, making enemies of those who should be brothers! All of you marching to your death are dear to me."

Above the battle, looking down upon these

fighting hosts, this sympathetic spirit sees that the men in the trenches do not fight with hatred. They are too close to reality not to know the ones they kill are their brothers. This he has always found in his friends in the trenches, so that to read the rasping cries of hatred, the shameless villifications and misrepresentations of the enemy is to him and to them "a horror and a pity." "I will not be a party to hatred," he declares, "I will be just to all my enemies. In the midst of passion I wish to preserve the charity of my vision."

Here, then, is the reason why the press and the "intellectuals" of Europe rose up in one accord against him. They demand "an eye for an eye." Romain Rolland desires his loved country, even while fighting to remain true to her highest ideals and her greatest traditions. He stands almost alone and says courageously what thousands of others would have said: Let Germany outrage the world; France must even in a sea of blood keep her garments white!

A Steadfast Soldier of the Spirit

Let no one infer from this, if he is unacquainted with Romain Rolland's general position, that he has given sympathy to the enemy or that he is working for an ignoble peace. From none has come such penetrating invectives of Germany as from his pen. He sees clearly that new conditions have arisen; wisdom demands that procedure be based upon all the vital factors involved. The war, he says, must prove an "anvil on which is forged under the hammer, the unity of the European soul." At this moment he is crowning his faith with useful service in the International Agency for Prisoners of War. This agency is a marvel of efficient ministry to hungry souls torn away from home and separated from loved ones. "What joy," he writes, "when one can announce to a family that the son or the father has been found."

That his efforts have not been in vain is becoming more and more evident. Nothing in literature is more revealing than the countless letters that have come to this prophet of the new spirit from his young friends at the front. A French captain of artillery writes, "There are soldiers at the front who, like Romain Rolland, try not to tarnish their patriotism with hatred and vengeance." I. B. R., a recipient of the *Croix de*

Guerre, writes: "I salute as a brother in arms the man who has strained all his strength toward this end—the defeat of the spirit of jealousy, misunderstanding, injury, reciprocal scorn and hatred among nations." This from another French soldier: "Our man at the front is Romain Rolland. We have only scorn for those who in the rear preach hatred. We have made the sacrifice of our lives, and do not want to die hating."

It is stirring to remember, in this connection, the last words of the English nurse, Edith Cavell, spoken just before her execution: "I see now that patriotism is not enough: I must die without hatred or bitterness toward anyone." There is every reason to believe after the cruel tides of passion have passed, the one man France will be proudest of will be this steadfast soldier of the spirit.

The American people should find themselves in full sympathy with this far-reaching vision. We, too, are pledged to the service of humanity. Hatred is foreign to the real soul of our beloved land. As our young men go forth to join the ranks of the warring nations they share more and more of the spirit of Romain Rolland. May those who remain at home likewise cling to justice and reason and love, and bear in mind, with Romain Rolland, that we are not fighting against the enemy so destroy him as much as we are fighting for the sake of the enemy to save him. Then the immortal words of our beloved Lincoln will become once again a living resolve: "With malice toward none; with charity to all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up this nation's wounds; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Few recent utterances of prominent Churchmen have been more heartening than the declaration of Bishop Guerry of South Carolina before a farewell meeting for Y. M. C. A. workers:

"At Camp Wadsworth, in my own State, an American officer who had just returned from France, told me that he had heard no talk of hate among our men in the trenches, hate is not the spirit which inspires our men to sacrifice, and we must not let it take hold of us. We must show ourselves worthy spiritually to win."

This surely comes nearer to expressing the mind of the church than the outcries of such ambassadors of hate as Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis.

The Riddle That Is Russia

Russia is desperately hungry, torn by factions, racked by terrorism and assassination. Allied intervention has so far made little conspicuous progress. From Baku the gallant little British force has had to retire because the Armenians and other races who were at war with Turks and Tartars failed to render effective aid. In Siberia the Allied troops with Czecho-Slovak aid have made sufficient progress to be able in all probability to withdraw all Czecho-Slovak troops in safety over the Siberian Railroad to Vladivostok, if to rescue them is still the principal object of intervention.

Meanwhile there are interesting developments to note in Japan. The fall of the Terauchi ministry which favored a "strong" Siberian policy may have an important bearing on affairs. The Seiyuki, the strongest single political party, is (or was until lately) opposed to intervention as being contrary to the real interests of Japan. The disturbed conditions in China, where there is virtually civil war, must profoundly effect Japanese policy and are not without their bearing on the Siberian problem.

At Murmansk the Allied forces so far hold this northernmost ice-free port unmolested by Germans. From Archangel they have somewhat extended their area of control. The Tschaikovsky ministry which promised well proved a weak reed and was soon deposed by a reactionary cabal of officers of the old Russian army. These gentlemen in true Gilbert and Sullivan style put M. Tschaikovsky and his colleagues on an island along with the old Bolshevik government, from which sad plight the Allies rescued M. Tschaikovsky and restored him to power! It is not surprising, however, to hear that he very soon afterwards resigned in favor of Colonel Duroff, a representative of a new central government which is being organized at Samara under the leadership of General Alexieff, the former Russian commander in chief. *The Manchester Guardian* not long since printed an Allied proclamation issued at Archangel stating that no Russian government could be recognized which did not consider itself at war with Germany.

American interest however has centred during the past month in the remarkable series of documents given out by Mr. George Creel, the chairman of the Committee of Public Information. These papers purport to show that the Bolshevik leaders were hired German tools, traitors alike to their cause and their country. Doubt has been expressed in some quarters as to the genuineness of these documents. The anti-Bolshevik *Evening Post* of New York has pointed out internal evidence seriously discrediting some of the despatches, and M. Nuorteva, the representative in America of the Anti-German Socialist Finns, in the *New York Times* on September 22nd gave categorical reasons for considering some of them to be Russian forgeries. The importance of Mr. Creel's revelations, if true, is so great that it is easy to exaggerate their significance and to lay the strength of the whole Bolshevik movement to German machinations. Of course to take any such position is grossly to misunderstand the whole history of the Russian Revolution and to ignore the vital forces which have found crude and sometimes violent expression in popular Bolshevism. In any case Germany is now very cool to her alleged Bolshevik "allies."

Up to September 25 that strange partnership has not been fruitful of any very valuable military aid either to Russia or to Germany against the intervening Allies. On the contrary the Centrist leader in the Reichstag, Mathias Erzberger, in his peace feeler (doubtless officially sanctioned if not actually inspired) specifically urges peace and understanding between nations in order "to prevent Bolshevik revolutions in all lands." If, as some would have us believe, the Kaiser is the sole creator of Bolshevism, it is certain that he is now feeling towards his handiwork much as Frankenstein felt when his monster stood alive before him. Strange as it may now seem, it is not impossible that Germany, rather than aid the Red forces she despises and fears (and has already ruthlessly crushed in Finland), will use this line of approach—fear of world wide Bolshevism—to win a "conservative" peace.

The second event which has stirred the American public is the President's vigorous denunciation of the Russian reign of terror. Apparently intervention has tended to aggravate this evil in those vast territories still out of reach of Allied guns. Whether the Russian Soviet Government is composed of tyrants seeking personal aggrandizement, or fanatics whose devotion to a cause leads them willingly to murder their opponents, the social consequence is disastrous. Terrorism is staining the Russian Revolution with innocent blood. It is fatal to the complete triumph of Revolutionary ideals in Russia or in other nations. When will men learn that we need revolutions in *methods* as well as in ideals; that freedom can never come by way of coercion?

We do not believe that thoughtful Americans, because of this reign of terror, will set down all Russians as cruel or incapable of orderly self-government. We must envisage the terror against its background of old oppression, devastating war, foreign invasion, lack of understanding of the Revolution in the western democracies, economic disorganization, hunger, and the fanaticism of contending revolutionary groups.

But in the darkness there is this gleam of light: The President's arraignment of Bolshevik crimes before the judgment bar of the world is another evidence of his faith in moral forces and in the power of an appeal to the reason and conscience of men. More than once he has combined such appeals with military action. Is it too much to hope and work for a world in which such a spirit and such an organization will prevail that an appeal to reason and justice may become, not an accompaniment to, but a sufficient substitute for an appeal to violence whether of war or of bloody revolution?

Since this was written comes the morning paper (September 27) with the news that Lenine has persuaded the Soviets to rescind the policy of terrorism. If this be true it is the best news that has come out of Russia for many a weary day and will give us new confidence for the future. Is it possible that this is Lenine's reply to President Wilson's appeal?—a reply which may pave the way for the withdrawal of Czecho-Slovak and Allied troops and the substitution of economic aid for military intervention.

By the Way

I HAVE been surprised at the plentiful lack of interest that has been shown by our newspapers, both daily and weekly, in the remarkable program recently adopted by the National Liberal Federation of England. This document has special significance as being the platform on which Mr. Asquith and his followers will stand at the coming general election. Let me briefly quote from its main provisions:

A League of Nations—"The greatest and most urgent constructive work of the statesmen and peoples of the world is the establishment of a League of Nations to protect the equal rights of states, great and small, to prevent future conflicts, and to secure the limitation of armaments."

Secret Diplomacy—"No treaty involving this nation in the risk of war should be operative until ratified by Parliament."

Civil Liberties—"The bureaucratic control of trade and labor, and the limitations imposed on personal liberty, and upon freedom of speech and of the press should be brought to an end as soon as possible after the restoration of peace."

Free Trade—"Convinced that protection maintains a high cost of living, and thereby impoverishes the people, encourages the formation of combines and trusts, increases the cost of production, injures the export trades and damages the shipping industry, the National Liberal Federation stands firm for Free Trade."

Ireland—"There will be no settlement of the Irish question except through the establishment of Home Rule."

Constitutional Reforms—"The existing House of Lords should be abolished and the Second Chamber should be on a representative basis."

The Dominions and India—"The Federation supports such constitutional reforms in India as will secure the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. The Federation supports such measures as will enable the self-governing Dominions and India to exercise a due share in the control of foreign policy and of other matters of common concern to the whole of the British Commonwealth."

Industrial Questions—"The time has come when there should be a fundamental change in the relations between employers and employed. The workers must be given a full share in determining the conditions that affect their own lives. Under the auspices of the Industrial Councils, there should be established for men and women in every branch of employment, a minimum wage which shall afford a proper standard of comfort and be a first charge on every branch of trade and industry. Hours of work should be established as will provide reasonable leisure and opportunity for self-culture. Provision against unemployment should be a first aim both of the Industrial Councils and of the State."

The Land Question—"The land laws should be drastically revised. The taxation of land values should be more fully developed. The State and local authorities should be given full powers to obtain by a cheap and speedy process whatever land is needed for any public purpose, present or prospective, at a price based on the valuation. Part of the burden of local taxation should be transferred from buildings and improvements to land values."

Housing and Health—"A comprehensive national housing scheme is a primary need, also a comprehensive public health service, which would include the establishment of local maternity and child welfare centers."

Prohibition—"The Federation favors full popular control of the liquor traffic, and the provision of public resorts for indoor recreation other than the public house."

The Rights of Sailors and Soldiers—"None of those who have served in the national forces should be allowed to fall into distress either from lack of employment or from any other defect in our social organization. Those who have been incapacitated shall be freely assisted to train themselves for new employment. State pensions to disabled men and to widows and children shall be sufficient in amount to secure a satisfactory standard of comfort."

Thus the historic Liberal Party lines up with the British Labor Party in announcing its future policy. It yet remains for Mr. Lloyd George, the other leader in the coming three-cornered fight, to state the program of his Coalition Party. So far the only plank that he has named is the establishment of a Preferential Tariff within the Empire, but it is difficult to see how that plan can be carried out after Mr. Wilson's recent pronouncement in his Fourth Liberty Loan speech that: "There can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League [of Nations]," and, again, "economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding form."

If Christianity is to be saved from annihilation in its organized form it is bound to construct a great catholic church on the lines of the new Internationalism which shall secure the union and fellowship of all the churches, and thus prevent for all time the jealousy, the fierce competition and the overlapping of Christian Societies, which have, after all, but one object in common—the salvation of souls.—Canon Morrow in "The Contemporary Review," August, 1918.

During the past month I have received several further suggestions for new formulæ to add to my "T N T" library. I am especially grateful to two friendly readers, one in San Francisco and the other in Philadelphia. Thus writes my unknown friend "M." from the city dedicated to the gentle Saint of Assisi:

"It is well known that many substances in themselves innocuous become highly explosive in combination with other substances equally innocuous. However, let me not presume to lecture on the nature of explosives to one who has announced that he is engaged in making them a subject of special investigation. But to indicate possible sources of raw materials may not be out of place. The following may be allowed in all safety on the 'five-foot shelf' as long as they are permitted to enter into no questionable combinations with thought: 'Why Men Fight' and 'Political Ideals,' by Bertrand Russell (Century Co.); 'The Choice Before Us,' by G. Lowes Dickinson (Dodd Mead); 'The Aims of Labor,' by Arthur Henderson (Huebsch); 'The Bolsheviki and World Peace,' by Leon Trotzky (Boni and Liveright)."

My correspondent is right: thought is the dangerous element, but safety lies in the fact that it is also rare. This, in my view, is largely due to the devastation wrought upon the human mind in childhood by our prevailing systems of education. Thanks to our free schools the perils of a free press are largely illusory. Let Mr. Burleson suppress where he will so long as he listens to the popular cry, "Hands off the Comic Supplement."

My other correspondent, "C. W. G.," writes from the City of Brotherly Love:

"I have been interested in your 'T N T' library, and have looked over the lists of the three months of announcement, wondering with each announcement how it happens that 'The Last Weapon,' by Theodora Wilson Wilson (the John C. Winston Company, publishers) has not been included in the lists. It may be that this book is not of the character of those you have in mind, but from what I know of some, if not all, of those mentioned, 'The Last Weapon' would seem to be a book likely to take its place in such a class of 'high explosives' as you suggest."

"The Last Weapon" is gladly accepted and put on the shelf.

"Memory is one of the curses on those who indulge in war."—Lieutenant J. S. Smith, U. S. Army, in "Over There and Back" (Dutton and Co.).

So Mr. Secretary of War Baker has been compiling a "T N T" library of his own. His recently published list of books that our soldiers must not read shows an unusually generous range of reading comparable only with Mr. Burleson's catholic taste in periodical literature. The wide scope of this new *Index Expurgatoris* is indicated by the inclusion of the highly dramatic, not to say melodramatic (and preposterous) "Revelations of an International Spy," along with Professor Rufus Jones's "More Excellent Way," with its quiet atmosphere reminiscent of a Friends' Meeting. That Mr. Baker has not let personal friendship stand in the way of duty is clearly shown by his naming "Why War?" the work of his friend and colleague, the Commissioner of Immigration. I am curious to know by what lucky accident "The New Freedom" was not declared "Verboten." Probably Mr. Creel saw the list just in time.

But in thus telling us what we may not read I doubt whether our cabinet ministers are doing all that they might do at this time. It is surely not enough that Mr. Baker should publish lists of forbidden books from time to time, and that Mr. Burleson should withhold our papers from us whenever they contain matter which he thinks we ought not to read. What we need now are lists of books that we *must* read (probably books like Ambassador Gerard's "Four Years in Germany" and "Over the Top," and, as *The Dial* suggests, volumes of Mrs. Hemans' poetry) and magazines (like Mr. Creel's *Bulletin* and *The Congressional Record*) that we *must* subscribe for. In achieving the great task of making the whole hundred millions of us think alike, it is obviously necessary that we must all read alike.

"While bureaucracy and efficiency can go together under an autocratic regime, it is impossible in the very nature of things for bureaucracy to go together with efficiency in a democracy. Nor, indeed, can paternalism and liberty exist side by side. Bureaucracy is either wasteful, stagnant, and inefficient, or it is, as in Germany, ruthless in its methods, oppressive in its spirit, and poisonous in its effect. It resents progress, vision, and innovation because these are disturbing and antagonistic to the very essence of its being—routine."—Otto H. Kahn, at the American Bankers' Association Meeting in Chicago, September 27, 1918.

A short time ago I had the unforgettable experience of hearing Miss Helen Keller (the deaf mute who can both hear and speak!) address a public meeting. By her speech and by her answers to questions afterwards, Miss Keller showed such an amazing courage and independence of thought and expression

that I could not help thinking that Senator Johnson, of California, was somewhat too complimentary to himself and to the distinguished body of which he is a member when he said recently that "free speech in America today is possible only in the U. S. Senate." Mr. Johnson forgot Miss Keller.

"The whole art of war is to know when to make peace."—Austin Harrison in "The English Review," July, 1918.

I am indebted to a friendly reader for the following remarkably timely quotation from an editorial in the New York *Herald* for April 16, 1865—the issue announcing Lincoln's assassination and death:

"Under the blows of the Army, skilfully directed by General Grant, and the firm and positive execution of the details of the political measures of Mr. Lincoln, the giant rebellion was, within the last month, brought near its end. In the midst of a success which gave assurance of the full and absolute achievement of both his fixed purposes, Mr. Lincoln suddenly gave evidence of the affection with which he has always regarded the South, and inaugurated a policy of concession towards state authorities which, without retarding or conflicting with the fixed purposes of ultimate Union and Abolition, hastened the rapid, and, it was hoped, bloodless dissolution of the remaining rebel armies. This policy, mistaken by many as an unwise conciliation towards the leading traitors, is not yet understood and appreciated because sufficient time has not, or had not elapsed when its author ceased to breathe, to show its effect; but we doubt not the day will come when the people will acknowledge that such a policy, pursued with Mr. Lincoln's usual persistence, would sooner have rendered the organized armies of the rebel leaders useless and ineffective than will any other which may be adopted. The apparent conciliations granted to the people of Virginia were not undeserved kindnesses to the rebel leaders. Without relieving a single rebel officer of any penalty which he might owe for crime, Mr. Lincoln's conciliatory measures were calculated to make it the interest of every private soldier of their armies to abandon them to their fate. Under the workings of such a policy as Mr. Lincoln inaugurated in Virginia, the dispersion of the rebel armies would have been more rapidly accomplished than it would be by the hard blows of Sherman and Grant under a less humane and more radical policy. In Mr. Lincoln the southern people have lost their best friend and the rebel leaders one of their wisest and bitterest enemies."

These wise words immediately challenge application to our problems of today.

"The chief causes of child delinquency may be summed up as follows: The war spirit, the absence of the father, the mother engaged in war work, uncertain conditions at home, the influence of the movies, pernicious literature, lack of home instruction, want of protection and recreation, absence of religious essentials and absence of suitable parental control."—Robert Peacock in "The Child."

Let me say by way of conclusion this month that I shall always be glad to receive from my readers any striking and quotable paragraphs culled from any source whatsoever for publication in these rambling notes.

"A battle lost is a battle one had expected to lose."—General Foch.

THE ROADMENDER.

Digitized by Google

Surfeit and Famine

A. J. MUSTE

THOSE who have the cause of true Christianity at heart have good reason today for preaching and practising a more disciplined and self-denying life. The history of religions and the lives of the saints of all times and of all faiths make it abundantly clear that the highest reaches of spiritual experience and power are not attained by those who deal over-gently with their bodies. The well fed, well clothed, always comfortable body may become a weight upon the spirit, even though innocent of any gross sin; while those who endure physical hardships often achieve spiritual insight and courage far beyond their fellows.

Though we have reacted, and rightly enough, from many of the principles and practices of monasticism, we may recognize in that ancient philosophy lessons which we in these days greatly need to learn. How can we explain the practically universal instinct in the saints to deny themselves sensual pleasures? Why do the New Testament and the Early Church couple fasting with prayer? When Paul feared that he might himself miss the goal, in spite of having taught others how to reach it, it was his body that he regarded as likely to cheat him of his prize:

"I bruise my body and bring it into bondage; lest by any means after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected."

It may be written down as an undoubted law of the spiritual life that the purest Christian joy is only for those who are willing to lead frugal lives, to endure some degree of physical hardship, and to limit the amount of sensuous pleasure in which they indulge. The pagan life, which many of those who call themselves Christians lead in these days, has in it some measure of beauty and dignity and joy. It is a cardinal principle of the natural life that the body is equal partner with the mind and soul, that its right to expression and happiness must ever be recognized. Not so in the Christian view. To the Christian the body is the bond servant of the spirit, even as the spirit is the bond servant of God, albeit freer and happier in such divine bondage than in its natural freedom. The Gos-

pel lays the law of sacrifice upon the body. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice."

All this greatly needs to be said and said again in these days. If it is hard to be religious on an empty stomach, as we are so often told (all the ascetics to the contrary notwithstanding), it is at least equally true that it is as impossible to be religious on an overfull stomach.

The Unnecessary Labor of the Poor

But another and no less important aspect of this question is whether our indulgence in numerous comforts and luxuries of modern life is socially defensible under existing circumstances. John Woolman said in "A Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich":

"Every degree of luxury of what kind soever, and every demand for money inconsistent with divine order, hath some connection with unnecessary labor."

And he was careful to point out that luxury had "connection" usually with the "unnecessary labor" not of the man who enjoyed the luxury, but of some one else who with difficulty procured even the necessities of life. And this is still the case. The time may come when all can have such a share of material things as some have now, but that time is not yet. Today some of us eat cake, because others have no bread. Some of us have luxuries, the production of which draws labor away from necessary work. The war is teaching us this lesson. We all realize now clearly enough that the maintenance of "non-essential industries" means the withdrawing of labor from the essential; that if one man has too much, another has too little. This fact was just as true before the war. The draining of men into industrial centers to busy themselves with the making of luxuries for the few was, even before 1914, bringing the Western world near to the edge of famine. It is a plain fact, far too little known, that even in those days of the armed peace millions of people in every country were living under famine conditions.

This being so, must we not ruthlessly cut ourselves off from "non-essentials" and luxuries? How can we eat our cake and know that some-

where one of our brothers lacks bread. We are inextricably bound up with the social order. But we need not be coward enough to take only its benefits. We can elect to suffer under it. It is the hero who remains behind when the ship sinks. "If any must die, let it be me," he cries. Can there be no such heroism in industrial life? Why should we not say, "We will starve for others rather than others should starve for us." Are there no Christian captains of industry who will deny themselves and live under the same conditions as those under which their workers are compelled to live?

To be definite, can we any longer continue to live in fine houses, eat in expensive restaurants, habitually use automobiles for pleasure, so long as all these things are types and symbols of the dispossession of the few by the many and have a close and inevitable "connection" with the "unnecessary labor" of the poor?

It cannot be said that such self-denial would be of little effect, that it would not mean more food for the hungry. In any case we cannot continue in wrong doing simply because ceasing from it may produce no obviously good results in others. Thoreau has trenchantly stated the case for us:

"What I have to do is to see, at any rate, that I do not lend myself to the wrong which I condemn. A man has not everything to do, but something; and because he cannot do *everything*, it is not necessary that he should do *something* wrong."

But secondly, if the call to a simpler basis of living were heeded by any considerable portion of those who profess and call themselves Christians or consider themselves to be socially enlightened, the economic result would be far from negligible. The voluntary saving of food by the American people is today making possible the feeding of thousands of our Allies. The voluntary abstention of many of us from "non-essentials" would strike a body blow at one of the main causes of much of the world's misery—at that which compels the many to minister to the whims of the few instead of to satisfy their own desperate needs.

The Vision of John Woolman

Thirdly, there is the moral reason. The redemptive power of the example of even a single individual who honestly seeks self identification

with the oppressed is incalculable. History is full of such cases. To take a modern instance, who can estimate the value for this hour of what the Englishman, Stephen Hobhouse, has done for humanity? There is no forgetting the story as Gilbert Murray tells it in the January number of *The Hibbert Journal*. Or to go back again to John Woolman's "Journal":

"In a time of sickness, a little more than two years and a half ago, I was brought so near the gates of death that I forgot my name. Being then desirous to know who I was, I saw a mass of matter of a dull gloomy color between the South and the East, and was informed that this mass was human beings in as great misery as they could be, and live, and that I was mixed with them, and that henceforth I might not consider myself a distinct or separate being."

Yea, when we seek voluntarily to make our lot one with that of the hungry and oppressed, are we not following the supreme example of him who took "the form of a servant"? Can we have any doubt of the efficacy of the redemptive method?

Finally, the question arises whether we can ever have peace on earth until all men are won to a simple life, comparatively freed from dependence on, or of desire for, material goods. The catastrophe in which we are involved today is in the last analysis due to human greed. No nation, no class in society, is guiltless. There are no indications that the pursuit of wealth is to cease when the war is over. On the contrary, one hears on every hand talk about the "drives" for new business that are to be made when the soldiers return, of the economic war after the war. Some actually propose to compete for the wealth of the world against the Central Powers. Others hope to have all nations, friend and foe alike, included in a League of Nations, so that all together may be free to pursue riches. And it must in fairness be said that the revolutionary movements in various countries centre not a little of their attention upon these material things; that all should have as much of what money can buy as some have now seems to be in the forefront of the minds of the workers of the world. Multitudes in all classes in all countries are guilty of such preoccupation with the material issues of this war that it behooves them to take to heart the reproach which an English soldier flung at the business class recently: "You calculate the profits to be derived from 'war after

the war,' as though the unspeakable agonies of the Somme were an item in a commercial transaction?"

In writing thus I do not mean to imply that we must not have economic changes, a fairer system of distribution, decent food, clothing and shelter for all, equality of opportunity. But as I see it there is grave danger in cultivating in men an obsession with the economic problem, a concentration of attention on material things. In a society where all are eager for as much as they can get, it is impossible that any should be satisfied, and it is certain that there will always be those who consider themselves unjustly treated. No system of distribution can bring contentment to selfish men.

Whatever economic system we devise, it is not to be supposed that the strong and clever will cease to exploit the weak and dull, so long as the will to possess and to exploit remains. If I read the Sermon on the Mount aright, Jesus, at any rate, did not believe that our hope lay in getting all men decently fed, clothed and housed first, and then organizing them into the Kingdom of God. These things, he said, were what the nations have always sought after first, and men who enter upon that pursuit have never got beyond it. His hope lay in men who had a lofty contempt for material things, who did not seek to lay up treasure on earth, who could be rash enough to think that if they cared supremely for higher things, the problems of food and clothing and housing would somehow take care of themselves!

If it be a truth that we must not forget, that without a certain amount of food and shelter human life is impossible, it is an even more important truth that until men quit caring for these things supremely, they will never get them—the many will starve while the few surfeit as from time immemorial,—nor will men ever achieve that society of love without which no amount of wealth will ever satisfy the human spirit.

But to breed in men a contempt for the material, a courage to live for unseen and eternal things, we must have this contempt and courage in our own souls and show them forth in our own lives. Here lies the highest service we can render to the world. Certainly those Christians whose social conscience has been stirred by present conditions will render but an ill service to the workers of the world if they encourage them to lapse into materialism or

to become absorbed in the pursuit of phantom luxury.

It is the idealism and spirituality of the masses of men that must be brought forth in the new day. Now when the worker seems to be near release from his chains of involuntary poverty, he must be shown the beauty and worth of voluntary poverty, of the disciplined, self-denying, spiritual life, lest he should become like the rich and powerful of the world and his last state be worse than the first.

Prisons and Men

The War Department has not yet abandoned the use of solitary confinement to punish recalcitrant prisoners. The situation described in the September issue of *The World Tomorrow* is, in fact unchanged. The only difference is that the three conscientious objectors have been transferred from Fort Jay to Fort Leavenworth, where the solitary cells are more hygienic.

An effort has been made in some of our newspapers to becloud the issue by claiming that the three prisoners are not conscientious objectors. Even if that statement were true, it would be immaterial, for the thing which arouses the indignation of any honest man or woman is that any human being—however base and cruel—should be confined, two weeks at a time, in a pitch black cell, with wrists manacled eight hours a day to the bars of the door, and fed each day on three slices of bread and three cups of water. Actually, however, the three men who have begun their second two weeks of such punishment are conscientious objectors. One of them (Robinson) had been adjudged insincere by the Board of Inquiry, which, we venture to say, had not time to listen to his full statement. As a result of the Board's decision, Robinson was court-martialed and sentenced to twenty years. The other two prisoners had incurred the displeasure of the captain in charge of the C. O's at Camp Upton by refusing inoculation (among other things) and were court-martialed on his presentation of charges. All three have refused to work in prison because they feel that such work is an indirect participation in the military machine and is in itself a recognition of the right of the State to conscript. Such men may be crazy, but they are not insincere, and it is a pitiful business when a mighty, democratic state must have its way with them at the cost of utterly breaking them in body and mind by the long process of solitary confinement whether at Fort Jay or Fort Leavenworth.

The War Department simply cannot afford to have this blot upon its fine record. Would it not be a good plan to borrow Thomas Mott Osborne from the Navy Department, where he is doing splendid work in the naval prisons, in the hope that he might suggest a way out? American citizens must insist upon immediate reform in their military prisons; and having won that victory they will find encouragement to go on to wipe out the whole vicious system of punishments now written on our criminal code, a system which without mercy damns the men and women—our brothers and sisters—who come within its clutches.

The Open Forum

The Individual Versus the State

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

A gloomy picture was left in my mind by Mr. Joseph A. Kyle's discussion in your July number on "The Individual versus the State." He concludes thus:

"We shall never return to the old days of rampant individualism. . . . This one limit must be set to the destruction of the individual. No social group . . . can justify itself if it minimizes the significance of conscience in directing men's actions. It is the only limitation that I can conceive of as putting any check upon this process we see going forward by leaps and bounds."

What a sad dreary world, if we are to have nothing individual left to us but our consciences! I look forward to a "world tomorrow" where individuality is increased, a world gay with color and variety, with free expression of individuality in dress, in manners, in play and recreation, in arts and crafts, and even, to some extent, in work and education; where a man, for instance, will no longer feel obliged to wear a dress suit which he finds both uncomfortable and ugly; and where, if he should so desire, he could walk down Broadway barefoot without attracting much attention. The State is not a sacrosanct entity in itself, as some Germans conceive it; it is merely a collection of individuals cooperating for their own benefit; and the welfare of the State can only be increased by increasing the welfare of individuals. All progress is of individuals for individuals, and by individuals. In a State where individuality is systematically repressed people will naturally tend to conform to a common mould with fewer and fewer outstanding personalities to lead them forward; it is the way of death. Certainly, material welfare requires cooperation in production and probably some form of a socialized State; but spiritual welfare and happiness can only be gained through freedom for the expression of individuality—greater freedom than we now have.

The chief fault of the old "rampant individualism" is that it was limited to too few people. For instance, a man expresses his individuality by running autocratically a huge business with a thousand employees. The master's unlimited self-expression prevents any self-expression or initiative in their work on the part of his thousand employees. In a democratic state this opportunity for self-expression must be given equally to all; accordingly, self-expression or individualism must be limited strictly to what will not interfere with the equal rights of others.

A law preventing child labor limits the freedom of a few employers to an insignificant extent; but when child labor is unrestricted a large number of individuals lose the opportunity for full development and are handicapped for life. So the law is justified. The general welfare may require more serious limitation to individuality than is involved in this law; but the limitation should be as slight as possible and according to the wishes of the large majority, and ample scope should be left for free expression in other lines.

Individualism and socialism may appear to be two opposing principles; but they can be reconciled because of the nature of man, because man is a social animal. Tagore says in his essay on Nationalism:

"The moral law, which is the greatest discovery of man, is the discovery of this wonderful truth, that man becomes all the truer, the more he realizes himself in others."

The altruistic or social impulses are an essential part of the person; and one who limits his activities to his personal selfish gratification fails in true and complete self-expression; the result is not happiness. Some people, however, have not learned this moral law; accordingly, it should be taught, along with propaganda for a social democratic, or individualistic, State.

M. S. McDOWELL.

Brooklyn, New York.

Hate and the Child

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

In Dr. Holmes' parable, "The Search," in the September number of *The World Tomorrow*, Hate was not found in the trenches, or in the military hospitals, or at army headquarters, but at a well-appointed table where were seated "an old, old man, a childless matron, and a curate." I agree that Hate dwells chiefly amongst noncombatants, but I think there should have been one other at that table—a child.

Here is a true story. The mother of two soldiers, an exceptionally fine woman, was seated at a table with a war map spread before her, tracing the movements of the armies. Her five-year-old grandson (with the face of a Raphael cherub) was playing on the floor beside her. The boy rose and looked at the map for a moment. "Where is Germany, grandmother?" With an amount of vindictiveness in face and voice of which I did not suppose her capable, the answer came, "We are going to wipe Germany off the map." The boy did not quite understand the words, but he knew full well that his loved grandmother, who of course is always right, hated Germany and all things German. For a moment he frowned, and his mouth straightened into a hard line in unconscious imitation of his grandmother's expression. . . .

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, and around to the Atlantic again, children are learning to hate—many, many children, and Hate is indeed "black as night and terrible as hell."

B. W. S.

New York City.

The Social Significance of Immortality

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

In his article on "The Social Significance of Immortality," in the August issue of your magazine, Rev. John Haynes Holmes is surely hardly fair to those to whom dogmatism about personal immortality is not merely repugnant, but seems socially dangerous. With all deference, I do not believe that there is any body of thinking men to whom "the immortal hope" is in itself repugnant. Even if a dream, it would be a very beautiful dream. Mr. Holmes has taken it for granted that "the doctrine of eternal life" and "the immortal hope" are synonymous, but he will, I believe, admit on reflection that "the doctrine of eternal life" as still taught by the majority of Christians might more fittingly be described as "the immortal fear." "The immortal fear" is, however, a superstition as repugnant to Mr. Holmes as to those who have no such confidence as he has in "the immortal hope," either from "the standpoint of abstract truth" or as a dynamic in the reshaping of society.

Mr. Holmes himself admits, in his endeavor to prove that the doctrine of immortality is of social value, that "its practical outcome in the past, as still very largely in the present, is a paralysis of social interest and social effort." This is certainly not an under-statement of the result of believing in immortality, and I believe it could justly be challenged as unduly severe upon the believers, but that is their affair, not mine. What I have in mind is the logical result of a fervid belief in immortality upon those rare Christians in whom it has been joined with a lively social interest and earnest social effort.

In the first place, it generally involves a complete refusal to face certain ethical issues in relation to the Universe, or, as they would say, God. This is very detrimental to those considerations of "abstract truth" for which Mr. Holmes is rightly jealous. It is clear that if there be a God, He visits the sins of the fathers upon the children—or rather, *some* sins of the fathers, making an entirely arbitrary distinction between the parental sins for which the children are punished and those

for which they are not. This is apparently unjust. No ethical justification can as yet be offered for visiting the drunkenness or impurity of the habitué of the saloon or the house of ill-fame upon his children, often in the form of a warped and stunted mind, while the child of the profiteer who grows rich upon the liquor or white slave traffic may escape scot free. As a matter of fact, of course, there is no human defence for visiting any parental sins upon any children, but the iniquity is made more glaring by the fact that it is not universal. Such considerations force some people to revise their conceptions of God and the Universe, but never, in my experience, anyone in whom "the immortal hope" is well developed. The great "truth" of immortality covers all such little inequalities in this fragment of life; the eternity of development will reduce such apparent injustices to less than the importance of a cut finger in a long, happy, well-ordered life here on earth. So with the whole problems of pain and evil—big enough to make us in our little way want to relieve them, but relatively not worth very much heart-searching!

This attitude automatically rules out anything in the nature of passing judgment on God, which is still as wicked as in the past. It is true that such Christians as have outgrown the blood-thirsty Jahweh have done so by weighing him in the balance and finding him wanting, that by the same process they have outgrown the God who needed to vent his wrath upon someone but was kind enough to accept Jesus as a victim instead of the rest of us. But it is not right to use our spiritual faculties with equal vigor upon the behavior of God as manifested in nature and humankind. We don't pretend to know so much about God as the ancients did, but we mustn't admit the possibility of His failing to satisfy our human standards of ethics, which are concerned with the quality of an injustice as well as its extent.

If it is important that we should form as nearly correct an opinion as possible about the nature of the world in which we live and the power or powers of which it is the manifestation, it is essential that we should not evade awkward ethical questions by pleading immortality as an explanation. After all, immortality is only an hypothesis, and whether true or not it has to be made in the face of a considerable mass of unfavorable evidence. In any case the prime need in social reconstruction is for clear thinking upon the facts actually available, and it is permissible to doubt whether this need will be served by the importation into the problem of speculative theories concerning a future life. If we possessed any means of obtaining reliable data concerning such a life, the subject would of course be worth investigation for the light it might throw upon the obscurer sides of human nature, but unfortunately, those who claim to be able to penetrate into the mystery that lies beyond the grave almost invariably develop so startling a disregard for all the rules of evidence and logic that we need no excuse for wishing to dissociate the solution of the practical problems of this life from spiritualistic research.

W. T. COLYER.

Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

To every lover of good works and great causes, the death of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, on September 12th, brings a poignant sense of desolation. His outward monuments are the great Abraham Lincoln Center, in Chicago, the Summer School and Settlement at Tower Hill, Wisconsin, the religious weekly, *Unity*; but the record of every civic and social reform, and of every battle for righteousness and human betterment, during the last forty years, is in part the record of his career. Total abstinence and prohibition, civil service reform, the education and full emancipation of the negro, the enfranchisement of women, the rights of labor, international peace, freedom and

fellowship in religion—all these, and many other noble causes, found utterance in his prophetic voice and support at his untiring hands. In referring to the fortieth anniversary of his paper, *Unity*, on March 7th, he said to me, "I have run over in my mind the beneficent and constructive social changes which have been accomplished in the last four decades, and I find that *Unity* has sustained them all."

In thinking of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, however, one recalls not so much these general public services, as certain distinctive achievements which were very peculiarly his own. In Chicago and at Tower Hill, he maintained centres of personal culture, which were nobly enriched by his love of the best in literature and art, and his rare gifts of interpretation. For years he was a lecturer of unexampled popularity before audiences of eager youth in schools, academies, colleges and great public assemblies. It was his originality of mind, and intense patriotic interest, which made him the first to suggest the purchase and preservation by the nation of the Abraham Lincoln birthplace in Kentucky. No man was more largely responsible for the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago, in 1893, than he; and no man did more in ways of practical labor for the success of this epoch-making assembly. A gallant soldier for three years in the Civil War, he became in his later years a foremost champion of the great movement for peace among the nations.

In personal character, Jenkin Lloyd Jones was the soul of geniality and goodwill. Democratic to the core, he was a lover of all sorts and conditions of men, and an unfaltering believer in the human nature that is in us all. His "guest's room" at Abraham Lincoln Center, open to every pilgrim of the spirit, was a fitting symbol of his open mind and hospitable heart. Especially did he love the young and ardent—those whose ideals were still fresh and faith unreckoning. He cherished each one of them as his own children, arming them with resolution, and helping them to courage. Barriers of nation, of class, of caste, of convention, of denomination, he abhorred and resolutely endeavored to tear down. It is as impossible to conceive of prejudice and hatred present in his soul, as darkness present in the sun. Religion was to him a way of life, and that way, love. He detested what he called "the excess baggage" of the churches; and in this sense accepted as a genuine tribute the remark of a Catholic priest, made in answer to the inquiry of an anxious mother as to whether she would let her boy attend the classes of Abraham Lincoln Center—"Let him go! Jenkin Lloyd Jones hasn't got religion enough to hurt anybody."

The last years brought sadness and disappointment. Uncompromising fidelity to his Christian pacifism cost him friends, closed against him familiar platforms and pulpits, and involved his journal, *Unity*, in difficulties. Of the injustice and inutility of current indiscriminating intolerance of minority opinion I have long been convinced; but never so surely as now when I mourn the unsullied purity and perfect love which were the life of Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

In a letter, written shortly before his death, to the Post Office Department, regarding the suppression of his paper, he set down, as with prophetic insight, these words:

"Of course I shall not be allowed to be a public nuisance to public functionaries very much longer by the Supreme Authority, who fixes the limits to the vigilance of his picket guards. My going hence will be a relief to some, but I hope I shall be missed by many little children and the teachers and parents who have found through me and through *Unity* some gleams of a mightier gospel than that which hatred and war can reveal; some joy in the thought of a brother bond that overreaches the trenches; and in a humanity that finds the bounds of a gospel 'above the battle'—a gospel undimmed by creed or party, by nation or race.

"In that faith I must continue until the discharge comes."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

New York City.

An Unpopular Patriot

HENRY J. CADBURY

This article is the third of a series dealing with the characters and the messages of the old prophets of Israel. Preceding articles by Dr. Cadbury in our issues for March and May discussed Amos and Jonah. It is not commonly recognized what an enormous debt our Christian religion owes to these austere figures of Hebrew history. Times may change, but the vision of these seers and the heart of their message will be valid while the race of men lasts.—The Editors.

THE Book of Jeremiah, in spite of its length and some confusion in order, presents a remarkably clear picture of a most dramatic figure. The simplicity of his message, the depth of his reflective lyrics, and the vividness of his experiences combine to make living and modern this ancient patriot of Judah. Jeremiah's lot was cast at the climax of his nation's woes. He saw his people pass from the happy, hopeful days of Josiah to the utter desolation of repeated disasters. Of Josiah's successors only two, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, ruled more than two or three months, and each of these brought on himself and his people the scourge of punitive conquest and exile.

In many respects the situation of Jeremiah resembles that of Isaiah just a century before him. Instead of Assyria Babylonia now held sway over all southwestern Asia. But in Judah a restless party, as in the days of Hezekiah, still chafed under foreign dominion. The prophet in each case deplored this political unrest and advised submission to the inevitable rather than futile revolt and entangling alliances. But Jeremiah maintained this stand further than Isaiah. For even when war was actually on and the besieging army surrounded the starving city Jeremiah did not wait for miracles to happen, or foster a desperate hope, but coolly advised the king and people to surrender and make the best terms they could with the enemy rather than await the more disastrous consequences of continued resistance. He explained clearly to the people the alternatives,

"Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death. He that abideth in this city shall die by the sword and by the famine and by the pestilence; but he that goeth out and passeth over to the Chaldeans that besiege you, he shall live."

To men obsessed with the blind absorption in war to the bitter end such open advocacy of desertion seemed treasonable and thoroughly disastrous. We are not surprised to read that the princes said unto the king,

"Let this man, we pray thee, be put to death; forasmuch as he weakeneth the hands of the men of war that remain in this city, and the hands of the people, in speaking such words unto them; for this man seeketh not the welfare of this people, but the hurt."

One can follow through many chapters the story of Jeremiah's persistent propaganda and its inevitable consequences to himself. With painful iteration and with constant variety of resource by speech and by writing he presented his unwelcome message. In many cases the religious authorities were his chief opponents. When Hananiah, the prophet, predicted the speedy breaking of the Babylonian yoke, Jeremiah dramatically answered the false hopes of his countryman in his own figures; the yoke of Babylonia is a yoke of iron and not of wood. When Jeremiah predicted the desolation of the Jerusalem temple the chief of police put him in the stocks. From their exile in distant Babylon the religious leaders and prophets complained of his propaganda of non-resistance and recommended that the temple officers give him condign punishment.

Even at his own home, the priestly town of Anathoth, his life was in danger and he found, like many another prophet, that a man's foes are they of his own household. How his life hung in the balance when again he predicted the downfall of the temple is told in inimitable narrative. The accusers, the defendant and the judges each speak in turn.

Then spake the priests and the prophets unto the princes and to all the people, saying, This man is worthy of death; for he hath prophesied against this city, as ye have heard with your ears.

Then spake Jeremiah unto all the princes and to all the people, saying, Jehovah sent me to prophesy against this house and against this city all the words that ye have heard. Now therefore amend your ways and your doings, and obey the voice of Jehovah your God; and Jehovah will repent him of the evil that he hath pronounced against you. But as for me, behold, I am in your hand: do with me as is good and right in

your eyes. Only know ye for certain that, if ye put me to death, ye will bring innocent blood upon yourselves, and upon this city, and upon the inhabitants thereof; for of a truth Jehovah hath sent me unto you to speak all these words in your ears.

Then said the princes and all the people unto the priests and to the prophets: This man is not worthy of death; for he hath spoken to us in the name of Jehovah our God.

Jeremiah's Escape

Only through the influence of Ahikam and the princes, and by the elders' happy recollection of the precedent of Micah more than a hundred years before was Jeremiah spared. But such good fortune does not always befall prophets of Jeremiah's mould. As an ominous parallel is told the fate of Uriah, a contemporary prophet who for similar "seditious" utterances was extradited from Egypt and executed by Jehoiakim. Indeed, the same king was only prevented from inflicting the same fate on Jeremiah and his scribe because, as the historian puts it, "Jehovah hid them."

The circumstances of this escape were these: Prevented, perhaps by special interdiction, from speaking in the temple, Jeremiah devised a new method of publicity. He dictated to Baruch, his scribe, the substance of his consistent prophetic message for many years past and then had Baruch read the prophecies aloud on a fast day to the multitudes gathered in the temple. The princes when informed of this proceeding first examined the writing themselves and then reported the matter to the king. So the king had the roll brought and read in his presence, but instead of repenting at the threatened destruction of his city, he destroyed the book, cutting off and burning it piece by piece as it was read, and tried to complete the suppression of its unpopular message by destroying its authors.

That Zedekiah treated Jeremiah more leniently than his predecessor appears to be due rather to the superstitiousness of the king than to any cowardice of the prophet, for now "the princes were wroth with Jeremiah, and smote him and put him in prison in the house of Jonathan the scribe," whence he was later transferred to the court of the guard. Once Zedekiah weakly surrendered him to the will of the princes who cast him into a dungeon of mire, only to be rescued by the kindly intercession of an Ethiopian eunuch.

Finally Zedekiah promised to save Jeremiah from those who sought his life and "Jeremiah abode in the court of the guard until the day that Jerusalem was taken."

The Basis of His Pessimism

If the outer experiences of Jeremiah are interesting, still more so are the inner conflicts of his mind. Shy and sensitive in his personal relations, deeply patriotic and loyal to his country, fundamentally optimistic in his faith, it was laid upon him to be an object of universal scorn, abuse and indignation and the herald of national disaster. The form of Jeremiah's message was political rather than religious. He was the spokesman of a diminishing and persecuted minority party, who opposed the current international policy of his government, and although the method of his address—the monotonous prediction of doom—is hardly the type of political argument that would be effective today, we must recall that to his contemporaries it was more cogent. His message was in accordance with the prevailing theory of his day that the moral test of any program is its practical success or failure, and that the clearest proof of God's disapproval of a course is misfortune predicted or realized as its result. Besides, the basis of his political advice was throughout the religious viewpoint. It was in this that he really differed from the prophets who opposed him. They overlooked the social crimes, the hypocrisy of the formal worship, and based their optimism on a superficial confidence in Jehovah's partisan favor for their nation, whether it was right or whether it was wrong. It was not even long-headed political sagacity that guided Jeremiah. As Davidson says,

"His assurance and announcement that Jerusalem should fall before the Chaldeans was not founded on his belief that so small a power as Judah could not resist the Babylonian empire. He had no such idea as that. The Babylonian empire was in Jehovah's hand, as all things else were. Jeremiah's assurance was the outcome of his profound conviction of the people's sinfulness, for which Jehovah must bring the state to an end. The optimism of the false prophets was based on their conception of Jehovah's power; the pessimism of the true prophets, on their conception of his ethical being." *

* Old Testament Prophecy, p. 305.

Indeed the very pessimism of Jeremiah is one of the grounds of his assurance. He knows too well the subtle pressure of public opinion that tempts the statesman or prophet to accept the popular or optimistic policy. But he feels his solidarity with the prophets before him who, though time may have vindicated them, seemed to their contemporaries traitors and pessimists. Indeed, the presumption of truth is on the side of such as these. It is to Jeremiah almost the proof of a true prophet that he is a prophet of evil.

And thereby Jeremiah is freed from the charge of wilful pessimism that so easily attaches to men in his position. He did not desire the evil that he predicted and he did not enjoy predicting it. He was not a professional objector nor the temperamental champion of the unpopular side. His love for his country is sincere and heartfelt, though he seemed to others a pro-Chaldean traitor. Sincere, too, was his personal suffering at his loneliness and isolation. The occasional outbursts of vengeful desire upon those who persecuted him are easily understood, and though they place him below the highest Christian ideals, they do not invalidate the sincerity and force of his anguish of soul. He knows himself "a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth." Yet he cannot do otherwise, he cannot withhold a single word.

O Jehovah, thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded; thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am become a laughing-stock all the day, every one mocketh me. For as often as I speak, I cry out; I cry, Violence and destruction! because the word of Jehovah is made a reproach unto me, and a derision all the day. And if I say, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in my heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot contain. For I have heard the defaming of many, terror on every side. Denounce, and we will denounce him, say all my familiar friends, they that watch for my fall; peradventure he will be persuaded, and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our revenge on him.

The Sorrow of an Unpopular Patriot

Thus upon Jeremiah there fell that unique sorrow—the sorrow of an unpopular patriot. Sharing all the suffering of his fellow citizens in the ravages of war and siege even to the extent of voluntary self-denial, he must bear beside the

intolerable burden of an outcast, misunderstood and unheeded, maltreated and abused, and above all, falsely accused of disloyalty and treason. No wonder that he cursed the day that he was born and prayed for vindication. Yet out of the crucible of suffering he developed a strength of character, a certainty of God and even a new discovery of religion that have made his name immortal.

And this discovery was nothing less than a new national ideal. For many generations the men of Israel had thought of religion in ethnic terms: the unit was the state. Jeremiah inherited this ancient conception. He symbolically identified himself with the sufferings of his nation. His whole being was filled with such a passion for corporate righteousness as we today with our training in individualism have only lately begun to appreciate with the awakened social conscience of our time and the religious vindication of national policies required by a world war. But to a Hebrew prophet the collective outlook was natural, and the novelty of Jeremiah's thought—a novelty due perhaps to his own unique isolation within his state—was the discovery of the individual in religion.

The climax of the Book of Jeremiah and perhaps the climax of all Hebrew religion is the promise of the new covenant. Among the doleful warnings of the prophet—jeremiads, as we call them—occur a few such hopeful strains. Here is a new ideal for the nation. It is a new covenant to replace the covenant at Sinai, but expressed in terms of personal knowledge of God and inward authority:

I will put my law in their inward parts and in their hearts will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me from the least of them to the greatest.

Thus the individualism of Jeremiah is at once the successor and the supplement of the old nationalism. The outlook is still national, but out of the burning pangs of his solitary sorrow it gained a depth and meaning that was unknown before. As Peake has said,

"The religion remains the religion of Israel, a national religion. God and Israel are still the contracting parties to the New Covenant as to the Old. But

the individualism which characterized the New made the religion national in a sense unattainable under the Old. For when the religion rested on external guarantees and was expressed in external institutions while its laws were imposed by an external authority, when, moreover, the people was contemplated as a unit, without reference to the individuals of whom it was composed, then it was national, but in a general and superficial sense. Only when every individual in the mass is renewed in heart and his will brought into harmony with the Divine will, can the nation itself be truly called religious. Through its individualism the religion first became national in the full sense of the term." *

*Century Bible "Jeremiah," vol. 1, pp. 45 f.

Amid the conflicting voices of international and party strife Jeremiah, the prophet of Anathoth, still challenges us by his unwavering fidelity to the voice of conscience. He calls us to advocate without compromise the highest ideals for our nation even in the face of contumely and misunderstanding. He recalls us from the impersonal concepts of party and race and nation to our own soul and the souls of our neighbors, and above all, he reminds us that only through the direct and spontaneous response of individuals to the righteousness which exalteth a nation can the kingdoms of the world become the Kingdom of God.

The Fall Campaign

While the Liberty Loan drive will considerably curtail the usual fall campaign, politics is by no means adjourned in America. The Republicans and Democrats (except in Socialist districts) mean to wage a very real contest for the control of the House. As the unedifying correspondence between Messrs. Hays and Tumulty shows each will claim to be the only party worthy to represent simon pure patriots and to sustain the government in the prosecution of the war. The cynic may be tempted to think that a more accurate nomenclature for these two ancient parties would be the Ins and the Outs. There are however signs of the emergence of the Republicans as the advocates of a glorified nationalism—protective tariff, universal militarism, and all the rest. Its leaders have a detestation of the internationalism and the "socialism" of the Wilson administration. It is not yet clear that the Democratic party will face the challenge of such an issue squarely. It would be a refreshing sign of the coming day if the President would lead his party boldly for democracy in industry and for the internationalism of a democratic League of Nations. Certainly the logic of Mr. Wilson's speeches points the way for the adoption of such a platform but we must remember that he has to deal with reactionary elements within his own party.

The new National Party is active in six states. Miss Rankin, of Montana, having been defeated in the Republican primaries, is, we believe, running on the National ticket for the Senate, and her fight is likely to arouse wide-spread interest.

The Socialist Party has recently adopted a forward looking congressional platform. Those who have thought that only the British Labor Party had prepared a platform of constructive policies for the new era should not fail to study this American program. In international affairs the Socialists declare for a federation of the peoples of the world, with an adequate representation of labor and socialist groups, of women, and of suppressed races and nationalities, both at the Peace Conference and in the Federation then to be organized. The Federation should have the power to prevent international disputes rather than try to settle them after they have arisen. And armaments are to be reduced to the point of eventual elimination.

In industrial affairs American Socialists stand for the permanent nationalization of the means of communication, and the co-ordination under national ownership and control of coal mines, water power and electricity. The platform calls for excess profits taxes approximating 100 per cent, a progressive inheritance tax approaching 100 per cent on large estates, and taxation of unearned increment from land. Further provisions deal with agricultural conditions, the minimum wage, a drastic reform of the penal system and practical action on other urgent social questions.

The danger of much socialist theory hitherto has been that it has trusted entirely too much to the State, and to political action through the State, and that it has not sufficiently considered the rights of the individual. It would be entirely possible to have a certain kind of socialism that would rest with stifling weight on personality, and make of the State even more of an arbitrary deity than it is at present. It is therefore with peculiar satisfaction that we hail the uncompromising declarations of the new Socialist platform in favor of civil liberties and the right of freedom of speech and of the press. Equally significant is this declaration,

"Government ownership without democratic management may become a greater menace to the world than the system of private ownership and exploitation which is passing away."

Thoughtful Americans including those most opposed to the Socialist Party will rejoice at this frank recognition of the dangers which threaten not only every system of State capitalism but also of State socialism. Socialists face no more important problem than the further development of a theory of social control of vital industries which will not impose upon men the oppressive evils of an omnipotent bureaucratic state—evils no political processes of initiative and referendum can master. The declaration in the platform which we have quoted above points in the right direction. Any radical platform appealing to labor for support which speaks boldly for democracy in industry and the rights of minorities is a hopeful document.

The Library

Political Conditions of Allied Success, by Norman Angell

(G. B. Putnams, New York. \$1.50 net.)

The Choice Before Us, by G. Lowes Dickinson.

(Dodd, Mead, New York. \$2.00 net.)

"'German Fears Vanquish German Sneers.' That's the greatest headline I've ever read. We've got the Germans on the run now and we'll not stop, till we get to Berlin." So a man behind me declaimed to his neighbor in the suburban train a few days ago. I was reading Mr. Angell's book at the time with its almost inspired lucidity of argument, and was smitten with a mad desire to stand up there and then and start to read it to that car full of suburbanites. I wondered if they would listen; would they follow the quiet logic wherewith Mr. Angell points out the hopelessness of our trying to achieve the success most of us care about (or ought to care about) simply by compelling Germans sneers to yield to German fears, or even by marching in triumph into Berlin? I had more than a suspicion that not many people in that car would listen to my reading; some of them might even accuse this most anti-Prussian author of being a pro-German. So I held my silence, and as I fell to musing upon the matter it seemed to me that possibly this might be the truth of the situation: If ever any nation or group of nations will act as reasonably and with such absence of passion as Mr. Angell urges the Allies to act, war will become impossible. The foe will be conquered by the fairness and good faith of such a program. But is not the belief of Mr. Angell and the little handful of "liberals" that sweet reasonableness can be generally inculcated in time of war, at least as Utopian as the belief of Mr. Bertrand Russell and other pronounced pacifists that an intelligent (to say nothing of a Christian) nation can find means to secure the ultimate triumph of righteousness without any war at all?

Be that as it may, "Political Conditions of Allied Success" is worth reading for its clear statement of the insecurity of a purely military victory and the vital need of internationalism. The most original proposal in the book is that a bi-cameral peace conference should be held; official representatives of the governments of the nations to form one group while a second and larger group is to be made up of representatives of the various national assemblies in which each party, socialist, liberal and conservative, is to be represented according to its strength in the parliament at home. We have here a notable suggestion as to the machinery of a democratic conference and ultimately of the League of Nations. We hope Mr. Angell will follow this book with one discussing more fully some of the more obvious practical difficulties. For example, does the parliamentary strength of each party correspond to its actual strength in country? How will the minority representatives get access to the necessary governmental documents so as to be properly informed for its task? What ought to be the relation of the two groups—the official and the parliamentary—at the conference? The idea is great enough—and hopeful enough—to command the widest attention and long and patient discussion.

Another notable book, from an English pen, which deals with some of the problems that Mr. Angell has in mind is "The Choice Before Us," by G. Lowes Dickinson, which has recently appeared in an American edition. The choice is one between a staggering development of militarism and the establishment of a real League of Nations. It is perhaps unnecessary to attempt an elaborate review of a book already well known to so many readers of this journal. It is not unnecessary however to remind them that in such chapters as the "Future of Militarism" they have a powerful antidote to the Rooseveltian eloquence. Books like this should be put on the local library shelves all over the country, and should be read by the fathers and mothers of the nation who most assuredly are not sacrificing their sons for any dream of Empire, but who need to be on their guard against both the ignorance of the many and the selfishness of the few, an ignorance and a selfishness which may make their sacrifices vain.

M.

To Our Readers

Many requests have come in from subscribers for back numbers of "The World Tomorrow." In some cases they are urgently desired to complete files for the purpose of binding. Our stock of the editions for January, April and June is either very low or entirely exhausted. We shall therefore be grateful to friends who can furnish us with copies for these months. It will be recalled that "The World Tomorrow" appeared from January until June under the title "The New World."

Who's Who Among Our Contributors

RICHARD ROBERTS is minister of the Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn, New York.

NEWTON BEN KNAPP is minister of the First Unitarian Church of Davenport, Iowa.

A. J. MUSTE is pastor of the Friends' Meeting at Providence, Rhode Island.

HENRY CADBURY is professor of Biblical Literature at Haverford College, Pennsylvania.

The World Tomorrow

is published by The Fellowship Press, Incorporated (at 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.), established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued, not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

The Fellowship Press, Inc.; Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.
Editorial Board of *The World Tomorrow*: Norman M. Thomas, Managing Editor; Edward W. Evans, Harold A. Hatch, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward, and Walter G. Fuller, Secretary.

Contributions to *The World Tomorrow* should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope if reply is desired.

The World Tomorrow is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy, annual subscription one dollar. Orders for copies, subscriptions and all correspondence should be sent to *The World Tomorrow* at the Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

New Lives For Old

IN the history of the world has it ever happened before that the lives of the men and women and children of a whole race have been cruelly uprooted from their native soil and flung into a raging turbid flood of suffering to be cast up—the few that have survived the maelstrom—years later on shores far distant, there to be saved by hands of pity, to take root again and grow into use and fruitfulness?

In 1914 the Armenians were living peaceful industrious lives in the land that had been their home at the time of the fall of the Assyrian Empire. They were tilling the fields their ancestors had ploughed and sown for centuries, and dwelling in the houses in which their forefathers had been born, had laboured and had died for generations.

One year later, for no fault of their own, but simply because of their race and religion, they were suddenly set upon by the soldiers of the Sultan, whose submissive subjects they had been, in whose armies their youth had bravely fought; they were robbed and ravished; their men hideously tortured and then slaughtered, the rest driven off in "caravans of death." Over high mountains and through burning deserts, half naked, famished, footsore, bruised with beatings and unspeakable indignities, they marched southward for months and years and their way was strewn with the bodies of those who had fallen exhausted and starved or who had been killed by the brutal soldiery.

Now a few thousand of those great multitudes are straggling into the towns in Palestine and Mesopotamia which have been made safe by British occupation. Seventeen hundred arrived in Jerusalem during Easter week, together with five thousand Syrian refugees, more than two thou-

sand in June, and so on. Other groups of wanderers are constantly arriving at the great Armenian camp in Port Said. They are mostly women and children, incredibly broken and emaciated with prolonged underfeeding.

Soup kitchens were opened by the American Relief Committee in Jerusalem for these refugees and for the destitute of Palestine; orphanages and hospitals established there and in other centers; industrial relief begun, and in July the Red Cross Unit sent from America arrived to help carry on the work of rehabilitation. The women are set to sewing, washing, mending for the British army, making garments for refugees, and making lace, to support themselves, the boys are taught trades, the little children put in school. New lives are being made for these poor creatures in place of the old. But what a gulf of suffering lies between the two!

But they are not safe yet from starvation. There is not food enough, not money enough to buy and transport food and material for their self-supporting industries. A hard winter lies ahead. Americans who have succeeded so wonderfully in building a great nation in the wilderness, can but want to lend a helping hand to these survivors whose task it must be to reconstruct the economic and social order in Turkey after the war.

The American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief

JAMES L. BARTON, *Chairman* — CHARLES V. VICKREY, *Secretary*

One Madison Avenue

New York City

PUTTING CHRISTIANITY TO THE TEST

To the challenging assertion that the War has revealed the failure of Christianity, the answer comes that the religion of Jesus has never yet been fully and fairly tried.

Believing that there are possibilities of Christian living, both for the individual and for society, far beyond our present achievement, *The World Tomorrow* calls for a new order of life, a new quality of faith, a new spirit of courage and adventure in the service of the Kingdom of God.

To such an enterprise the coming peace provides at once the challenge and the opportunity.

We stand at the end of an epoch—perhaps even of a civilization.

Soon we shall be faced with the gigantic task of rebuilding our ruined world. How shall we set about it?

The World Tomorrow demands that Christianity shall be put to the test here and now, that its principles shall be applied in all human affairs in a spirit simpler, more direct, more honest than anything the world has ever known.

Will You Join Us in This Great Constructive Task?

We need your help as we believe you need ours.

If you are not already a subscriber to *The World Tomorrow*, fill out the accompanying form and mail to us today. If you are already on our list try to secure at least one new subscriber this month.

To the
FELLOW-
SHIP PRESS
115 E. 28th St.
New York City

Please send me
"The World To-
morrow" for one
year, beginning with
the number.
I enclose \$1.00.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

APR 18 1919

\$500 FOR AN ESSAY ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

PRINCETON, N. J.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. 1. No. 11

NOVEMBER, 1918

10 Cents

A Democratic League or A Sheriff's Posse?

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street

New York, New York

Through the interest and generosity of a few friends *The World Tomorrow** is able to offer

A PRIZE OF \$500

for an original essay on

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS: ITS PRACTICABILITY AND ITS NEED

The idea of the League of Nations has been raised to supreme importance by the statesmanship of President Wilson and by the common desire of plain people everywhere. There is, nevertheless, a necessary service to be rendered in the clear interpretation of this great ideal.

It will be the task of the writers of these essays to define the basic principles of the League and the lines along which it ought to be developed, remembering both the lessons of history and the limitations and possibilities of human nature. The essays must be constructive. We do not ask for elaborate discussion of machinery or of technical procedure. Primarily we seek new definitions, a new philosophy of the state, and new motives in human relations, of which the League of Nations should be the natural organized expression.

The following persons have kindly consented to act as judges:

JANE ADDAMS, Chairman of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace.

NORMAN ANGELL, Author and Publicist.

AMOS PINCHOT.

CHARLES A. BEARD, Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research, New York City.

FLORENCE KELLEY.

HENRY GODDARD LEACH, Secretary of the American Scandinavian Foundation.

The essays presented in this competition must not be shorter than four thousand nor longer than seven thousand words. Each essay must be typewritten, signed by a nom-de-plume, and accompanied by a sealed envelope giving the name and address of the competitor.

The World Tomorrow reserves the right to the first publication of the prize essay, but will release the copyright to the author within one month after publication.

Essays must be addressed to the Contest Editor of *The World Tomorrow* at 118 East 28th Street, New York City, and reach him there not later than January 31st, 1919.

**The World Tomorrow* is a monthly magazine published by the Fellowship Press at 118 East 28th Street, New York City. Price, ten cents a copy or one dollar a year postpaid.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. I. No. 12

DECEMBER, 1918

10 Cents

What of the Future?

THE Great War of the Nations is over. After more than four terrible years the old silence returns to the long battle lines. The self slaughter of man by his own machines has ended. The wild furies of destruction no longer stalk upon the earth or fly through the heavens or creep beneath the waters. The song of peace this Christmas will not echo like some ghastly mockery in homes from which fathers or sons have gone to battle.

The end has come in the sudden and complete overthrow of the Prussian militarism which had become the type and apotheosis of brutal might. The Kaiser, the head and front of the whole hateful system has abdicated not at the demand of a foreign foe but because his own people would have no more of him. Not even his histrionic ability could make his exit impressive. No jot or tittle of romance has attended the end of the proud houses of Romanoff, Hapsburg and Hohenzollern. These half comical, half pathetic figures no longer strut about the modern stage. They have passed unwept, unhonored and unsung.

And yet strangely enough the world seems unaware of the ending of its long agony. We have looked in vain for any such pæan of praise as we had imagined would come if ever the war ended in victory. True there have been for a day or two exuberant and spontaneous celebrations all the world over, and in countless homes has come a sense of relief and happiness too deep for utterance. Yet we suspect that the joy of victory has been tempered by concern lest after all we should not win that for which so great a price has been paid.

The man in the street knows very well that we must plunge at once into the difficult and dangerous period of so-called reconstruction. While

we cannot here and now attempt adequately to discuss the problems that face us, we may briefly refer to certain imperative steps which must be taken if for us Americans the coming of peace is to mean the establishment of a nobler and fuller democracy.

I

Repressive Legislation Must be Repealed

First, we must abolish at once those restrictions on freedom of conscience and freedom of speech, which since we entered the war have been embodied in legislation, in executive policy and in trained and organized popular intolerance. It is the peril of the moment that the average American does not even realize the extent to which he has been denied his most elemental right to trustworthy information and to free discussion—without which rights democracy is a delusion and a snare. True, the military censorship of the press is now suspended, but that restriction never was as objectionable as the general control of all news by government departments and by a reactionary and servile press. The most indifferent among us will hardly say that American citizens ought not to know all that happens at the coming Peace Conference at Versailles. The plenipotentiaries there with the best will in the world will not be able to establish a just and lasting peace unless the peoples they represent can be informed of all the facts and educated by free discussion. The mighty and sinister forces of economic imperialism will have their way with us unless our eyes are enlightened, our ears opened and our mouths unstopped. But with Mr. Creel in Paris in charge of "public information," and Mr. Burleson in Washington in control of the cables, these three great gates to Mansoul are likely to be more often closed than open.

The case of Russia is to the point in this connection. For several months past there has been *no American newspaper correspondent anywhere in European Russia*, and all dispatches from that country have been rigorously censored by the British authorities. Is it any wonder that we get "news" foisted off on us such as the recent amazing adventures of Babushka, the "little grandmother of the Russian revolution." First we are told of her death in September and of her burial by the Soviet government, next we read of her execution by the same government in October and now, just as if nothing had happened, we are calmly informed that she is coming on a visit to America in December apparently none the worse for all she has gone through—in our newspapers.

Even more serious is the terrorization of conscience and opinion which made our distinguished visitor Bishop Gore, of Oxford, express himself openly at a recent gathering in New York as fearful for the future of American liberalism. Records of mob violence at expressions of opinion are the commonplace of our newspapers. We have ourselves seen detailed information of over one hundred cases.*

Meantime our prisons are filling up with men and women who still believe in freedom. Nearly three hundred conscientious objectors are now in Fort Leavenworth undergoing sentences running from ten to thirty years. Many of them are suffering under a brutal form of solitary confinement, a form of torture which an aroused and indignant public opinion must insist be taken out of all our military and civil prisons without delay. Under the Espionage Act over one thousand convictions are on record (to say nothing of hundreds of indictments not yet brought to trial) involving the right of free speech. And then there is the wholesale suppression or intimidation not only of radical but of liberal papers.

The facts regarding a recent case well illustrate the judicial tyranny that has all but mastered us. A little group of Russian Jews in New York, mere children, all but one still in their teens, pathetic,

half-starved, yet burning with a passion for freedom, prepared and distributed leaflets in English and Yiddish protesting against our intervention in Russia. The Yiddish pamphlet suggested a general strike by way of protest. The language of both these leaflets might be considered intemperate and abusive—though in their references to the President the writers did not attain the vituperative heights of Colonel Roosevelt or Colonel Harvey. These amateur pamphleteers used their own press. They had no connection with any organization. Six of them were arrested; of these one died in the Tombs as the result, his friends allege, of "the third degree" at the hands of the police, five came to trial—four men and one eighteen-year-old girl. The atmosphere of the court was hostile from the start. One of the defendants, who proved that he had nothing to do with the documents, was acquitted. The others were found guilty. In passing sentence of twenty years imprisonment upon them, Judge Clayton made use of language that was in contempt of all dignity or fairness. Bail, pending appeal, was denied. No European country can show anything like such a sentence. In Germany under the old regime men who did much more than advocate peace strikes, men who organized them, were sentenced to terms of from 18 months to three years. In England, John Maclean, the Glasgow school teacher, who, about a year ago, preached open rebellion to the ship workers on the Clyde, was sentenced to five years. It is an added disgrace that because these East-siders were immigrants without friends or influence, their fate is so much more severe than it would otherwise be.

While such things are possible in America, while loyalty to conscience may be punished by imprisonment under barbarous conditions for 25 years, while youth fired with sympathy for Russia can be sent to jail for 20 years, we may well ask whether our country can claim to be the reservoir from which streams of justice and democracy shall flow for the healing of the nations?

We have dealt thus at length on the necessity for restoring and enlarging our civil liberties. We do so because this fundamental question is too commonly ignored. Liberty of speech and of opinion must be our first demand. That won we may proceed to other issues.

* Except in the behavior and continued existence of the victim, there is nothing peculiar in the recent incident in a crowded New York theatre, when an officer of the Department of Justice shouted from the stage to a member of the audience whom he had been badgering for a contribution to the War Fund, "We'll get the money from you if we have to use a blackjack." Mr. Henry Ford naturally resented this violent language, but he must know that it is but typical of what has been going on for months past during the various money raising campaigns.

II

Our War Ideals Must be Maintained

Chief among these is the necessity for an unshakable determination on the part of the nation to remain true to those ideals for which we entered the war. The President declared amidst almost universal approval that we had "no quarrel with the German people"; they were scarcely less oppressed by their masters than were their subject peoples. And yet when at last these who were enslaved have awakened and cast off their tyrants' yoke, how do we greet their liberation? Has there been a general shout of praise for their act? On the contrary, many respectable citizens who were valiantly killing the Kaiser with tongues or pens a little while ago now openly regret his forced abdication at the hands of the German Socialists. We fought to make the world safe for democracy, but lo and behold, we are now fearful lest Germany have too much democracy. We fought to end war, but in the hour of triumph we have shown as yet little of that spirit of reconciliation which is the first and last guaranty of enduring peace.

We cannot believe that the present attitude of newspapers, patriotic societies and some preachers, is characteristic of the true America, of a nation which has been known in times past as generous, tolerant, patient and kindly—a nation of which the man Lincoln is the ideal type and expression. There is still time for American generosity to assert itself. It is not too late even yet for us to bring about a peace of justice and reconciliation among the peoples of earth. Will the churches any longer remain silent? Will they in this Christmas season once again shirk the practical application of "the old, old story" they preach about so eloquently?

III

Industry Must be Democratized

Then there is the task of creating a new economic order which shall be democratic. This labor of Hercules will brook no avoidance or delay. In every one of the warring nations, even in Japan, the workers are demanding not so much the control of politics as the control of industry. They are beginning to see that no League of Nations can permanently avert war and preparedness for war while the amassing of wealth and the earning

of a living are matters of anti-social control and unbridled competition. They are beginning to see that no democracy can be a true democracy which continues the existence of a system under which the few own the land, the mineral wealth and the tools of production which the many need in order merely to exist. They are beginning to see that it is a democracy hardly worth making safe for the world in which a million men are too poor while a hundred men are a thousand times too rich,—even if the million have each the right to mark an occasional ballot paper.

Already the problem of "putting industry on a peace basis" is assuming gigantic proportions. As we write comes news of 12,000 workers earning from \$20 to \$25 a week (9,000 of them women) who have been discharged at one week's notice, from the gas mask and aeroplane factories in Long Island City. The Federal Employment Bureau is reported to have scoured the city of New York and neighborhood for work for these people and to have discovered what looked like a tacit understanding on the part of employers of women that \$9.00 was the maximum wage they would pay. It is unthinkable that the workers will long accept such a situation.

On this subject the American Federation of Labor is fully aroused, and Mr. Gompers has already served notice in unmistakable language that organized labor will not abandon the advantages it has won during the war. Already the workers are quick to turn to their own use the fine phrases that have won popular sanction for the war. An admirable instance of this is shown by the editorials of *The Hotel Worker*, the organ of the waiters now on strike in New York City. This, says the editor, has been a war for democracy; we have given men and money to overcome autocracy; will the hotel workers then continue any longer to accept the dominance of the "hotel junkers"?

Behind all this labor "unrest" is growing a new demand that does not stop at wages that are worthy of the laborer, or at tolerable working conditions, but goes on to the revolutionary claim for the democratic control in industry. Everywhere are signs that tell that the thoughtful, forward-looking workman is no longer willing to barter industrial freedom for the "full dinner pail" held out to him by the politicians. As Peter Troelstra said a few days ago in the Dutch

parliament, "not much longer will the worker continue to barter his birthright for a mess of pottage."

Of the working out of this new demand we shall say no more at this time than these two things: (1) that the privileged classes have an opportunity to make the inevitable transition to a new economic system, both orderly and just, by voluntary renunciation of their privileges through schemes of partnership looking to the establishment of democratic ownership and control of industry and the ultimate abolition of our present system of profit and wages; (2) that the workers have an opportunity to carry on their struggle for true freedom by education, agitation, political action and economic organization without resort to the organized violence which always defiles ideals of

freedom, and always proves in the long run self-defeating, whether in the strife of nations or of classes.

If it be objected that both these pleas are counsels of perfection, we answer that the world needs just such counsels, and that it is the weakness of our faith in the capacity of men to act nobly which is the fountain head of our woe.

Despite our victory in the war, the road ahead is rough and dangerous. We cannot see its end from the beginning. But light and strength will come to us as we are loyal to three great principles: A trust in truth which scorns coercion, a passion of reconciliation which is just and generous to a fallen foe, a faith in democracy whose greatest work is yet to be done. So only shall a new fellowship be established among men. N. T.

Signs of the Times—An Editorial Survey

Remember Brest Litovsk

Mighty as it was, Marshal Foch's military power was only one factor leading to the downfall of the German Empire. A second factor was the temperate and democratic diplomacy of President Wilson backed by Allied labor and liberal opinion. A third and no less important contribution was the powerful influence on the minds of the German people of revolutionary socialism, particularly of the Russian Revolution. History may well bracket together as conquerors of the Kaiser such strangely assorted leaders as Marshal Foch, President Wilson, Arthur Henderson and citizens Lenine, Trotsky and Liebknecht. The forces these men represent will not much longer cooperate, even involuntarily. Already the stage is set for a gigantic struggle between economic imperialism and social revolution—a mighty drama to which the great war has been but a bloody prologue.

In the meantime, unless revolution spreads unexpectedly, military power holds the whiphand. The possession of this power creates enormous temptations. Germany has accepted a drastic armistice some of whose provisions seem less designed to prevent resumption of the war than to crush—if need be—the newborn revolution. The excesses, real or imaginary, of this German revolution may yet provide the moral excuse (so necessary to the Anglo-Saxon mind) for imperialistic intervention, as did the sad plight of the westward moving Czecho Slovaks in Siberia. Yet however severe the terms of the armistice, it remains true that actually Germany surrendered on the basis of the President's fourteen points. If we now ignore those conditions, Germany may be powerless to resist, but let us not deceive ourselves by thinking that the inexorable law of sowing and reaping will be suspended on our account. For any injustice we may do now the future will pay in new agonies. The words "Remember Brest Litovsk" should be written on the

walls of the conference room at Versailles. Alas that such a warning should be necessary, but already many of our newspapers are filled with an almost contemptuous rejection of the President's terms. In high places at home they are openly flouted; in high places abroad they are courteously but firmly whittled down or explained away. We do not wonder that the President feels it necessary that he should attend the Peace Conference in person.

As we value our own honor and the future peace and happiness of mankind, we must set ourselves at whatever cost to uphold those essentially just terms, and to oppose either a peace of vengeance or a peace designed to crush the social revolution. Both these dangers are real and imminent. To strive to avert such a betrayal is the duty of every believer in democracy.

If Thine Enemy Hunger

In the amazing catalogue of American achievement in this war nothing stands out in more creditable light than the willingness of our people to give the force of law to the requests of Mr. Hoover, as the food controller. Have we not in this vital matter a clear illustration of the power of cooperation in a great cause where the compulsion is primarily moral, not legal? The signing of the armistice does not mean that we can afford to be weary in well doing. On the contrary there are now opportunities to save hundreds of thousands of lives from starvation in countries hitherto closed to aid by war. Asia Minor, the Balkans, Russia and our former enemies, the Central Powers, wait anxiously for our relief. Surely none of us could bear his own company, if through carelessness or indifference he should refuse to do his share in saving food that might keep a starving fellow-being from death. Out of this international cooperation in feeding the hungry, as Miss Jane Addams has suggested, may grow a real federation of peoples—a League of

Nations resting "not upon broken bits of international law, but upon ministrations to aid primitive human needs."

It is gratifying that Mr. Hoover has already sailed to Europe to plan for food distribution and aid "especially to Russia." Famine, he does well to remind us, is the mother of anarchy. Perhaps there might have been less anarchy in Russia today had we put more faith in feeding the Russians than in shooting them. The necessity of averting "anarchy" in Germany may be a good reason for feeding our late enemies. Nevertheless we confess that we are disquieted at the emphasis on this motive for doing the ordinarily decent human thing. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him" is an injunction quite irreconcilable, of course, with a state of war, but surely we may remember it when the fighting is over? Yet the armistice continues the blockade in full force and leaves Germany almost entirely dependent upon Allied compassion for food. Mr. Hoover suggests that if we lift the blockade in certain particulars Germany can get along. This would seem to be a simple act of pity and of humanity. Why then is it not done?

Surely regardless of the relation of famine to anarchy Americans will desire by generous dealing with the German people in the matter of food to lay firm and strong the foundation of lasting good will. We must be on our guard lest the power which our control of food gives us be used as a club against a type of revolutionary government we do not like. To withhold food which cannot be distributed because of widespread disorder is one thing, but to withhold it on this pretext when actually we desire to hinder a great experiment in social democracy is another and very different thing of which on no account must a generous America be guilty.

Some Questions for Liberals

Why is it at the moment of his supreme triumph as arbiter of the world's peace, Mr. Wilson should have a hostile Congress thrust upon him? This unwelcome fact must have aroused in him both as statesman and student of politics, no little searching of heart. It is a problem too that is not without interest to his liberal friends. In their consideration of it such questions as these may well occur to them:

If the tremendous appeal of the last Liberty Loan drive had not been directed wholly toward the primitive passion of hate of the Hun, would the electorate have failed so generally to see the superiority of Mr. Wilson's conception of justice "even to those to whom we do not wish to be just," over let us say Mr. Roosevelt's doctrine of vengeance? Surely Mr. Wilson can hardly expect to win popular support for his policies if he lets Mr. Roosevelt's spirit inspire the publicity campaigns of his subordinates.

If Mr. Wilson had been less trustful of the power of his personal appeal and had been more eager to inform and organize public opinion on the basis of principles firmly and courageously held, would the Republicans have won a majority in both houses?

If Mr. Wilson had not deliberately approved the legalized tyranny of the Espionage Act, and the autocratic and reckless administration of that Act by the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice, would he have found himself at election time lacking the support of radical opinion, which he so sorely needed to counterbalance the virulent reactionary

criticism which could not be suppressed because it came from quarters too powerful for Mr. Postmaster Burleson and Mr. Attorney General Gregory to attack?

If Mr. Wilson's liberal friends had been able to see that sometimes you can better support a man by being ahead of him than being behind him, might not he and they now both be in an infinitely stronger position to fight for the principles he has at various times so nobly enunciated?

We shall not attempt to answer these questions categorically, but this much we do assert: Repression defeats liberalism. It is bound to do so in the very nature of things. Repression at first strengthens reaction but sooner or later it feeds the smouldering flames of revolution. It is fatal to precisely that policy of ordered progress which Mr. Wilson and his liberal supporters profess to desire. If the Congressional election helps to teach this elemental truth to our bureaucrats whose characteristic vice has been intolerance of radical minorities, it will have been a blessing in disguise.

The Triumph of "Fusion"

It is impossible to regard the recent Republican victory at the polls as a clear mandate for economic imperialism, high tariff, universal military training and a peace of vengeance. Neither these nor any other great issues were presented to the people. Even the President's appeal for support was based rather on endorsement of himself than on any clearly defined principles, and was complicated for liberals by the insufficiency and obscurantism of a large number of the candidates who wore the Democratic label. In other words, the election of a Republican Congress by no means proves that Mr. Roosevelt, let us say, would have defeated Mr. Wilson had this chanced to be the year of a presidential election. Moreover, so close is the party division in the Senate, that the balance of power will fall into the hands of Senators Borah, Gronna and La Follette who, to put it mildly, are at least as liberal as any Democrats.

But when all is said and done we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the recent election was of a sort which is bound to encourage the jingos and the junkers here and among our Allies. As things now stand, America is the only great nation (except Japan) where socialism is unrepresented in the legislative chambers, for Mr. Berger, of Wisconsin, can hardly be said adequately to represent American Socialism. One need not be a party socialist to regret that at a time when the working class movement is sweeping Europe our Federal Government should be without any congressional spokesman to interpret the progress of events to our eminent Southern statesmen like Messrs. Gregory and Burleson and to our no less eminent statesmen of the North like Messrs. Lodge and Penrose.

If This Had Happened in Russia!

The Bureau of Legal Advice at 118 East 28th Street, New York City, has just issued a pamphlet giving a report of its activities during the past year. The work of the Bureau has been to assist in securing a fair trial for a great variety of cases arising out of the war time legislation, especially the Selective Draft and Espionage Laws. While this organization is local in its scope, the kind of problems it has faced are national in

their significance. Its report therefore gives, as it were, a cross section of the injustice that has flourished everywhere under cover of patriotism. The facts here recorded we fear could be matched, perhaps even exceeded, in almost every section of the United States. There is much in the pamphlet that calls for quotation but our limited space permits us to mention only one case. Let us take that of Samuel Nikition. It is a case that has attracted little public attention, but the facts are sufficient ground for the disbarment of the magistrate concerned.

"Samuel Nikition . . . is now serving six months in prison as the result of Magistrate Mancusco's animus and the Bureau is carrying an appeal in his behalf. Nikition is a Russian, not three years in this country, who refused to buy a Liberty Bond when urged to do so by a group of canvassers in the Village Theatre on the night of October 2. . . . Nikition was severely beaten, rushed to the Tenth District Night Court and there, without counsel, or even an understanding of the proceedings (his testimony was given through an interpreter) was convicted on the statement of his accuser alone. . . . The words of Magistrate Mancusco in sentencing Nikition are a sinister commentary on the lawlessness which has invaded our very courts—'I'm surprised that the people in the theatre permitted you to come out at all. They should have lynched you right then and there. If anyone was brought before me with a charge of that kind I would send them away with the commendation of the Court.'"

Readers of this pamphlet will find some explanation of the growing distrust among the working class for justice as now administered in our courts.

Are These Men Cowards?

"The other conscientious objectors—the ones who have been sent to prison—are not religiously inclined men at all, or at least mighty few of them. They have been plain cowards, Bolsheviks, Socialists and anarchists. They have been representatives of about the lowest type of men imaginable. They seized upon the name conscientious objector in order to save their skins and in order to get out of fighting for that country which should mean everything to them." From the *Baltimore Evening Sun*, Nov. 18, 1918.

So runs a common charge against the C.O.'s. In other words we are asked to believe that the three hundred objectors in Fort Leavenworth, virtually all of whom could have escaped their ferocious sentences by accepting non-combative service or farm furloughs, are cowards? Who are some of these same cowards? A few facts may not be out of place since the personal issue has been raised. One of these men, Howard Moore, while himself a prisoner has been awarded a Hero medal and \$500 by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, for the gallant rescue of a woman at the risk of his own life. This man, whom the Carnegie Commission calls a hero, but who is a coward in the opinion of the *Baltimore Evening Sun*, is now confined in Fort Leavenworth in a solitary cell with his hands manacled high above his head nine hours a day. He sleeps on a cement floor between foul blankets, is forbidden to read or write or talk, is fed on bread and water—and all this for the sake of loyalty to conviction.

Another man, Evan Thomas, voluntarily gave up congenial work and unflinchingly accepted confinement in one of these chambers of torture in order to make his protest against the

coercion of his comrades, where religion or other scruples would not permit them to work in a military prison. With Moore and Thomas in the "hole," as the prisoners call the dark sub-basement where the solitary cells are located in this "modern" "model" prison, there were on November 15 some twenty other men of many races and creeds. Some of these prisoners had been cruelly beaten; one had been in solitary confinement for more than fifty days. But they had all remained loyal to conscience. These are the men the *Baltimore Evening Sun* calls "cowards." In their ranks are Russian and Mennonite farmers, Socialist workmen, college professors, social workers, differing widely, but brothers in courage and in loyalty to their ideals. Has America come to such a pass that she must break such men spiritually, mentally and physically in order to feel secure?

The mother of one of these men has kindly consented to our publishing here part of a letter which came to her a few days ago from her son in Fort Leavenworth Prison, where he is now serving a sentence of twenty-five years. We have sought permission to quote from this letter so that our readers may have the opportunity, of which from the beginning we have all been wrongfully denied, of hearing one of these men speak in his own, and in his fellow prisoners', defence:

"DEAR MOTHER: I have just completed my first fourteen days of solitary confinement and am well and strong. You have absolutely no cause for worry. I have been on bread and water, but will be on full diet now for the next two weeks. I finally refused to continue work here solely on the grounds of my belief in the liberty of conscience. There are a number of men here whom I know will die rather than work under these conditions. These men are not dangerous opponents of the state, however anarchistic their present action may seem. They are for the most part peaceful followers of obscure religious sects or else radical non-resistants with socialistic leanings. So far as I know most of them are religious objectors. This country surely is big enough for such people. They would be useful members of society at work outside. I simply can't keep my own peace of mind working outside when I know that these men must see this thing through. You know my objection all through has been to conscription. While the war was on there might be reason in the state's refusal to let objectors to the draft go free, but now I can see no practical reason for punishing them so severely. I have worked here and most certainly will work again if such men are given some sort of consideration by the government. It is no matter of pride with me to say I have been consistent and have never submitted to conscription. If it were merely that I would certainly quit and go to work for your sake. But I can't feel like anything else than a quitter to leave the ship now when there is still danger that these extremists may have to pay a costly penalty. The American people surely are liberal enough to allow these men liberty to conduct their lives in accordance with their own conscience as long as they do not injure others.

Perhaps—and this high hope sustains these men—out of all their suffering will come one great good—the entire abolition of the use of a barbarous form of solitary confinement for recalcitrant prisoners. It is torture, as stupid and unnecessary, as it is cruel. No decent man can rest content until its use is abandoned for all prisoners. To that end we urge our readers to give the widest publicity to the facts which come to us from prisoners in whom we have absolute confidence. It is a bitter commentary on our press that for the most part it either refuses or basely distorts all news dealing with this problem. We believe, however, that pressure from individual citizens may help to end this evil.

Furthermore, we urge an immediate demand on the War Department for the reform of conditions in military prisons and the proper treatment of conscientious objectors and their release at the earliest possible date. We make our plea less for the sake of the men who are suffering and more for the sake of the honor of America. We who tolerate such conditions without protest share in some degree the guilt of that military bureaucracy which is directly responsible.

Peace and the World's Children

HENRY NEUMANN

THE author of "Mr. Britling" struck a true note when he made the mourning English father put by his bitterness as he thought of the enemy parents who also mourned a departed young life. England in arms could have nothing in common with Germany in arms; but England bereaved and Germany bereaved could come together in grief over their unoffending sons. May not the new world that is dawning take hope in this suggestion that the people of enemy lands can unite in common hopes and fears for their boys and girls?

The thought recalls a scene at the Hague six years ago. The occasion was the assembling of the second International Moral Education Congress, where the utmost differences of nationality, race and faith were represented. Buddhists, Parsees, Mohammedans, met in conference with Jews, Christians, infidels from the western countries. But though there were several outbursts of sharp feeling over religious and nationalistic differences, the dominant note of the conference was one of earnest concord. The reason was the underlying sense of a common moral peril. Whatever the causes and the remedies offered, all were united in the conviction that the whole world faced the same dangers to the moral health of children. Today it is no less a fact, to put it mildly, that the world's children are exposed to a common and grave moral peril. But how many people realize this? How many are sufficiently concerned to spend themselves for this reason alone, if for no other, to render further wars impossible?

The Children's Indictment of War

No mere enumeration can compass the hurt which children everywhere have suffered. The mention of the names Belgium, Poland, Armenia, is enough. Shell-shock, starvation, devastated lungs for children! How little can words describe the reality! It is possible to compute the number of the world's orphans; but arithmetic can never tell what boys and girls have lost and will continue to lose years hence through the loss of their fathers. Nor can it estimate the loss to the child in the home or in the foundling asylum who will never

know even the name of the soldier responsible for its birth.

The hurt done by child labor is another familiar story. In England alone, thousands of children as young as ten went into the factories until this flagrant menace to the future vitality of the nation became obvious enough to call for a halt. The effects will be felt for years to come. The lure of high wages has tempted youngsters to drop schooling who else might have continued. Those who have stayed have lost incalculably by the curtailment in public expenditures for schools and other institutions. Just consider how essential it is in order to get real teaching that the size of classes be reduced from their present average of fifty; in England some classes have been obliged to include as many as one hundred.

The damage done abroad by underfeeding we can surmise from its effects over here where scarcity has been less acute. Shortly before our entrance into the war, Dr. Josephine Baker, of the Child Hygiene Division of the New York Health Department, put down the number of children in her city alone who were markedly undernourished at seventy thousand. The price of milk has since gone up. After six months of war, Dr. Chapin, specialist in children's diseases, told the Academy of Medicine that the number of underfed children in New York City had increased by at least fifty thousand. The death rate among the younger children for this period was exactly twice that for the corresponding period before our entrance into the struggle. In October, 1918, the same authority testified that the number of underfed children in New York City was two hundred and sixteen thousand. The cost to children abroad has very probably been greater. A letter from Petrograd several months ago mentioned the price of eggs as fifty cents apiece. When we read of rice riots in docile Japan, we may be sure that children there have been counted among the hungry.*

* This bit of history from Japan tells a significant story: "I am sorry to say that very lately, since the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5), when the Japanese people are almost crushed by the weight of taxes to . . . pay war expenses and to keep up army and navy, the number of cases of female infanticide is increasing alarmingly."—From Prof. J. K. Goodrich's "Our Neighbors, the Japanese," p. 82, quoted in Payne: "The Child and Human Progress," p. 89.

While there is no guarantee that a robust constitution creates a healthy soul, it is undoubted that for the average child a constitution enfeebled by malnutrition means a weakened will. This sinister item must be added to the world-wide damage of these years. Add also the increase in overt juvenile delinquency. Not one country alone but all report that mischief and actual crime by youngsters have mounted greatly. What else is to be expected when the father and older brother are at the front and the mother is either at work or otherwise unable to keep her wilder boy in hand without the usual assistance? Is it surprising that the boy of more than average scapegrace propensities, when he hears the praises of red blood sung everywhere, should fail to distinguish between legal and illegal ways of manifesting his own? The wilder sort of lad is untroubled by scruples about justification; to him every war-time suggestion to red-blooded conduct carries its own immediate appeal. On every side—at the movies, in the hurraing crowds, in the recitals of prowess, his more feverish impulses are quickened enormously by the prevalent excitements. Small need for wonder that in him, too, the primal thing is aroused which at its worst breeds the atrocities of the adult. The case of the young girl in these times makes another sad showing in the reports from the police and others.

But while the increase in juvenile misdeeds is pitiful enough, it is after all confined to a minority of the nation's children. More subtle and more widespread is the peril besetting the child in the "good" home and in the classroom—the universal damage done by filling youthful minds with ideas more likely to retard than to accelerate the coming of a saner world order.

The Ideals of Tomorrow

Today our children have had a year and a half of war—and a war crowned by victory, without the sobering effects of extended poignant suffering. Have the impressions upon the minds of these future citizens been the sort that are likely to promote an era of genuine world progress?

We ask this question because much as the coming of a better order may be helped by juster economic institutions, by world parliaments and the like, the new society will after all remain a society of human beings; and that it will be a better society rests on the hope that the men and

women who constitute it will be better men and women than today's. The forces impelling people to take up arms are seated in the impulses, the habits, the emotions, the ideas and convictions that make us the kind of persons we are. No reliance upon new social mechanisms should blink the fact that in the last analysis wars break out because the world is peopled by such a sorry mixture of man and brute as most of us still are today. The ultimate guarantee that wars will disappear forever is the embodying in human hearts and minds of habits and ideals immeasurably nobler than those accepted now.

Commonplace though this truth is, its importance comes home to us when we realize that the ideals of tomorrow are being shaped in the boys and girls of today. Is there not something pathetic in the circumstance that we are reminded *ad nauseam* of tomorrow's dependence upon the present when we are asked to look after the physical welfare of children but scarcely at all in connection with the political and ethical outlooks of the new society?

"It is as necessary to make the future citizen strong as it is to back up the boys in the trenches today." "The health of the young today is the nation's safeguard ten years from now." These are among the watchwords of charity societies and boards of health in their multitudinous appeals to conserve the physical strength of the young for a possible conflict later. Where is there anything like the same concern for the better thoughts which these children should be thinking then? Two or three years ago, before our country had become involved, one of our papers printed a cartoon in which the war-god was represented as hanging on the door of a children's diseases laboratory a placard saying: "Spare this place. We shall need these babies when they have grown up."

Will they indeed be so needed? Or will the world have helped its children to reach the point where they themselves will say, "No! that need has gone forever"? In whatever way the future may answer that question, this much we can declare with certainty today: when provocations to war arise in the life of the next generation, the men and women of that day will frame their replies better or worse according to the impressions the children of the present day imbibe from the spirit now prevalent. The German child has

heard parents, teachers, clergymen, public officers, everyone to whom he has been taught to look up, call upon God to punish England. When that child reaches manhood, will this example have helped him to lend a friendlier ear to counsels of international good-will? Will children in other lands for their part be any better disposed? Young minds are plastic. Emotions of fear and hatred, kindled by wrongs that children have seen with their own eyes or have otherwise felt vividly, are the easiest to keep warm. Grown men and women can be expected to distinguish between the sin and the sinner, hating the wrong without personal passion against the wrong-doer. Can little children perform this fear of moral psychology? Surely they ought to receive far more help in this direction than they get from the usual utterances of their elders, from the newspapers, from the posters and other appeals of the day.

Here in our own country, in this age of unbridled publicity, young ears and eyes get much from which a more discriminating patriotism would seek to screen them. "Good" homes and schools do not always remember that necessary as they may think it is to keep hot the temper of a narrow nationalism in adults, the effect on the men and women of the future may be to hinder that world-concord which they profess now to desire. During the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution, the children were given toy guillotines to cut off the heads of toy aristocrats with little thought on the part of their parents that this was hardly consistent with their own watchword of "fraternity." Are today's examples to our young any more consistent with the professions of our time that the nations have fought a war against war?

I say this not at all in despair. It is true that a child's emotions run easily to extremes and that because they center most about concrete objects, the child will hate and fear intensely persons rather than false systems or evils as such. But fortunately there is this other circumstance to remember: children's feelings change with more or less rapidity, and in this fact there is ground for hope albeit a very sober hope indeed. We must not lose courage. On the contrary, those whose thoughts have been fixed upon the underlying moral tragedy of war itself rather than upon the excesses of a single war-maker must redouble their efforts to see that children receive all possible

encouragement to reap the better fruits from today's harvest of worldwide woe.

As True Now As In 1915

Help in this direction is suggested by the resolutions adopted at the meeting of the National Education Association in July 1915. The value in recalling today the conviction expressed by educational leaders three short years ago is evident. When our relationships grow entangled, it always benefits us to bring back to mind, if we can, the principles which we avowed in our calmer hours. At a time when we as a nation had not become a party in the world strife, it was possible for us to envisage the larger aspects more dispassionately and therefore with something of a truer appreciation of the difference between hating a wrong as such and hating it only as it hurts ourselves. To recall this vital distinction, these words of 1915 convey a useful message to homes and schools for the days ahead:

"We have made great progress in industry and scientific work, but little as yet in establishing justice, good will, and the reign of law among nations. Our education . . . has been based upon too narrow an outlook. Nationalism has been pushed to the front and emphasized rather than international justice and good will. The heroes of each nation's history have been those who have done the greatest injury to other nations and who have killed the greatest number of foreigners rather than those who have conferred the greatest benefits on mankind. . . . The people of each and every nation need to sink their nationalism in a larger internationalism and to learn and teach the true place of their country among the nations of the earth. The task would not be so difficult if once it were resolutely undertaken. The people of different nationalities do not by nature hate one another and many illustrations of international friendliness manifest themselves at any opportunity. The masses of the people do not want war, but peace. . . .

"Perhaps the greatest task which lies ahead of the school in all countries is that of bending its energies toward the creation of a new order of international friendship, justice and good will. . . . Entirely new values and standards for judging need to be created among the different peoples. In particular the teaching in history and geography needs to be entirely re-directed. The emphasis now placed on the deeds of the soldiers should be shifted to those who have created the best of our civilization and rendered the most lasting benefits to mankind. The emphasis now placed on wars should be shifted to the gains to civilization made in the intervals between wars, and war should be shown in its true light as a destroyer of what civilization creates. . . . The fact that war is the breakdown of law and order and civilized society should be made clear. . . . The shaping of a new international policy looking ultimately toward international peace and good will and the preservation of the slow gains of civilization calls for educational statesmanship of a high order

and will require time . . . but it represents the greater constructive task now before those who direct instruction in every nation."

The Challenge of the Future

The tasks confronting the school, the home, the church are immense; but the principles are quite simple and clear. The spirit of service to which children have responded so eagerly as a war need must be linked to the performance of constructive ventures. Now that they have been taught, for instance, that people must farm, must mine, must build and do other work not primarily for personal profit but for the good of the country, we must press this point at every step; and more insistently than ever we must associate the idea of patriotism with the thought of serving the country through one's daily work.

It need not sound so very strange to be told that when you are young, you can perform distinctly patriotic service by fitting yourself to do with the greatest unselfishness and with the highest skill the most useful work which your talents can perform. Put this ethical consecration of vocational aims in the foreground and keep it there. Encourage every possible practice in cooperation for worthy objects, in order that from earliest childhood, young people may learn by experience what splendid things can be done by working together for upbuilding aims. Make the most of the wholesome delight in team-work. Professor James' idea of the moral equivalent of war is a challenge and waits for skilful teachers and far-visioned school boards to give it practical effect. Put to its best use every interest which war times have stimulated. See, for example, that the new interest in Belgians, Poles, Italians, Czecho-Slovaks, Armenians does not end in words of sympathy or even in gifts to these people in their native lands: direct it also to a friendly concern for these folk of a different stock right here in our own country. The thrift, the self-denial, the simpler living that children have been besought to practice as a war need, can be practiced for other unselfish purposes if their elders care enough. In short, take the best in every wartime exhibition of service, of courage, of gratitude and of self-sacrifice, and consecrate it to the furthering of something better than the kind of civilization with which the majority of folk are still content.

Difficulties? Undoubtedly. It is not impossible

that the fervent idealisms of wartime may be succeeded in many persons by a period of moral exhaustion. Efforts for a better training in home and school may be obliged to meet many such waves of reaction. They will be confronted by many a deep-seated and passionate prejudice and many a vested interest. We may be sure that backward-looking groups in our communities will not be averse to making our schools the hotbeds of the narrowest nationalism or training camps for "efficient," unthinking industrial servants.

But these are challenges; and when the fear oppresses us that the future may be even worse than the present, let us look for encouragement at the faces of our children to read there once more the ultimate faiths which move us. In their frank young eyes we shall catch again a foregleam of that finer, nobler human society we want our earth to know. And for the sake of what we behold in this forecast, we shall count no effort too hard to guarantee that at least one member of the family of nations shall experience from today's world tragedy the utmost of its permanently purifying effects.

Peace or Armed Peace?

A document which is well worth our readers' attention is an open letter which Amos Pinchot has recently addressed to the American representatives at the coming International Peace Conference (a copy of which may be obtained at the cost of postage, five cents, from Mr. Pinchot at 101 Park Avenue, New York City). It is entitled "Peace or Armed Peace?" With lucidity and force Mr. Pinchot reviews the struggle of the great financial interests for world markets, carried on under the cloak of patriotism and in an atmosphere of secret diplomacy, which led at last to the world war. He points out that there can be no real peace if these same policies and this same exploitation are to prevail after the war—though now perhaps on an even larger scale. Already economic interests are directing the attack on Russia and the threats against socialistic Germany. Already it finds expression in the plans of our financiers for the kind of peace which, to quote Mr. Pinchot's banker friend, "will bring incalculable benefits to America, for it will result in an Anglo-French-American banking and business supremacy. . . . England and France are the older and receding civilizations, and America the youthful giant of the future, but, of course, American people need discipline."

This frank point of view will not be presented to the public in all its nakedness. It will be fully adorned in patriotic glory. No conceivable scheme of a League of Nations will avail us anything if we continue idle and indifferent as to the facts which for those who have eyes to see stand out in these days as plain as a pike staff.

By the Way

I AM indebted to M. B., a reader who lives in the back woods of New Jersey, for the most striking newspaper quotation of the month. The clipping reached me with the brief comment, "Can you beat it?" I confess I can't. Seldom does anything so simple and honest find its way into what Mr. Wilson quaintly calls "our public prints." To Mr. Charles Stewart Davidson, of the American Defense Society, and to the New York *Tribune* we are indebted for this rare glimpse into the depths of the well of truth. Mr. Davidson's article is entitled "The Victory Trap," and amid much food for thought contains the following admonition:

"We shall unconsciously aid Germany's ultimate object by as much as we may centre our opposition upon the mere individuality of the Kaiser. Indeed, we might say that in substance we shall have distinctly aided Germany should we make peace upon her changing her government for a more liberal form.

"Without her Kaiser but with her industrial army Germany is triumphant. 'The Kaiser' was a valuable emblem for us to make use of to crystallize sentiment against the evils of autocracy, but we must not allow ourselves to be run away with by a mere 'slogan' after it has served its purpose. 'A League of Nations' which includes Germany, if she be thereby entitled to receive her aliquot share of the raw materials of the world, coupled with the prevalence, if not of free trade, at least of 'most favored nation' clauses, is 'Germany victorious.'

"A point therefore to be considered closely is whether Germany is or is not to be admitted to a 'League of Nations,' if such be formed. It would seem safer to exclude her, or she will devour the world again, starting from the point of vantage. There is no question involved here of revenge or hatred, or reprisals, or any matter whatever of that kind; the question is whether Germany shall be allowed to commercially win this commercial war."

I hope *The World Tomorrow* will not be considered unavailable for reprinting that last sentence. After all it should be remembered that the split infinitive is Mr. Davidson's (of the American Defense Society) not mine.

"If Germany were to go the way of Russia, then all talk of indemnities and punishment and reparation would be futile; we should be like a man who is prevented by the sudden death of his antagonist from executing the vengeance and carrying out the punishment on which he has so long been brooding."—*The New Europe*.

The other day I was glancing through a volume of translations of Chinese poetry and came across the following lines by one Su Tung Po, who flourished—or perhaps I ought to say, judging from internal evidence of his work, did not flourish—during the 11th Century, A. D. This remarkable verse, the only example of his writings that has come down to us, so far as I know, is entitled "Congratulations on the Birth of a Son," and runs thus:

"Families, when a child is born, want it to be intelligent. I, through intelligence, having wrecked my whole life, Only hope the baby will prove ignorant and stupid; Then he will crown a tranquil life by becoming a Cabinet Minister."

It is a universally admitted truth that it is unhealthy to think and that true wisdom lies in not thinking at all.—*Anatole France*.

The other day I was privileged to see a letter from Romain Rolland, written last August to a friend in Cambridge, Mass. Who does not feel his heart lifted by the fine courage and hope and vision of the following?:

"The world will give us full justice later on. In the meanwhile, we have not wasted our time; the test will have permitted us to revise all the intellectual and moral values, of which we believed ourselves sure—men and ideas. We shall shed the old skin and come out having grown a new one.

"The idea of Panhumanism is in the air, at this moment. I have just received an article entitled 'The New Humanism,' by a young Belgian of an encyclopedic mind, George Savton. I hope that after the war all these efforts will unite and harmonize. Happy those who will be still in the fullness of their physical and intellectual forces. The task will be magnificent. I perhaps shall not see that time, but I rejoice in it in advance. It seems to me that I already hear the choir of the great voices of all our universe—*orbis, urbis*—of the world and of the city—the City of Humanity."

Belief in the State is a barren faith, as well as a degrading faith. It does but encumber our cause and shuts out from us that higher world in which we ought to live. It is like a mist that hangs around the surface of the earth, and beyond which the sunbrightened sky of the higher life shines serene.—*Lord Hugh Cecil*.

Another letter of a very different quality was shown to me a few days ago. It was written on September 19, 1918, on the official letter heading of the First National Bank of Las Animas, Colorado, and was addressed to Mr. W. F. Ebright, of Caddo, Colorado. It runs thus:

"Dear Sir:

"We received in today's mail a check for \$16.50 given by you some time ago to the Non-Partisan League. We have taken the liberty of refusing payment on this check believing that you have of late months found out enough about this organization to make you approve of our action. We have done this in a number of cases for our customers and without exception we have found every one of them were very much pleased that we handled the matter in this manner, and trust that you also will agree with us when we say this is a dangerous organization and that you will get nothing for your giving. However, if you desire this check paid we will comply with your request.

"Respectfully yours,

"EDW. S. RISLEY,
"Cashier."

I wonder what Senator Borah, who owes his recent reelection to Congress to the votes of this "dangerous organization," would say if he saw this letter. And yet perhaps Mr. Edward S. Risley, cashier of the First National Bank, is not mistaken in regarding the Non-Partisan League as a dangerous organization. Curiously enough that is just how the League regards Mr. Risley's organization.

"The star of financial and economic supremacy that has been travelling westward since the dawn of civilization, from the Orient to Greece, Rome, Western Europe, and that now rests over London, will again move onward in its course and—cross the Atlantic. In contemplating this picture there spreads before our eyes a vista of a world of boundless opportunities which await young American bankers of the present generation."—*From an address before the National Convention of the American Institute of Bankers at Denver, Sept. 19, 1918, by John E. Rovinsky, Vice-President of the National Bank of Commerce in New York.*

I have to thank an English correspondent for the following interesting incident:

Scene: A lonely country road on a Devonshire moor.

Dramatis Personæ: Conscientious Objector working on the land is leaving work. A motor-cycle, driven by an Army Officer, with side-car occupied by a Church of England clergyman, pulls up.

Officer: "Will you tell us if we are right for Widdecombe, young man?"

C. O.: "No, you are on the wrong road"—*proceeds to give full directions.*

Clergyman (with a winning smile): "By your accent I see you are a stranger to these parts. What part of the country do you come from?"

C. O.: "I was brought up in Hertfordshire."

Clergyman: "You are here as a substitute I suppose."

C. O.: "No, I am a Conscientious Objector."

Clergyman (turning sharply to Officer, winning smile all gone): "Come along. Let's get out of this contemptible fellow's presence."

Officer (apparently ignoring the request): "Do you belong to the Princetown settlement?"

C. O.: "No, I am under the Friends' Army Unit."

Officer: "Thanks very much for directing us. I am afraid it's going to be a dirty night. (*With a wave of his hand.*) Good-bye."

"We must beware, I think, of the spirit of the clergyman who marked his thankfulness for the good news on Sunday the 10th, by preaching no sermon that morning."—*The Bishop of Manchester, England.*

LOOK UPON THIS PICTURE AND ON THAT

BERLIN, Nov. 12, 1918.

To Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, White House, Washington, D. C.:

"The German women and children have been starving for years. They will die from hunger by the million if the terms of the armistice are not changed. We need the rolling stock of the railways to bring the food to the cities. . . . The women and children all the world over have been the innocent sufferers of this terrible war, but nowhere more than in Germany. Let it be through you, Madame, to implore our sisters in America, who are mothers like ourselves, to ask their Government and the Allied Governments to change the terms of the armistice so that the long-suffering of the women and children of Germany may not end in unspeakable disaster.

"For the National Council of Women of Germany.

"GERTRUD BAUEMER,
"ALICE SALOMON."

NEW YORK, Nov. 16, 1918.

To Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, White House, Washington, D. C.:

"The Women's National Committee of the American Defense Society respectfully urges you to disregard message from the German women reported in the newspapers of Friday. It is the belief of the members of this organization that the German people, including the women, must be made to realize their new position in the world.

"It is undoubtedly the intention of the Allied leaders to deal with the German people in a just manner, and to relieve distress in Germany. It seems evident that this is just another piece of German trickery and has some ulterior motive."

Man, inventor—of justice, duty, patriotism, and all the other "isms" by which even those who are clever enough to be humanely disposed are persuaded to become the most destructive of all the destroyers.—*George Bernard Shaw.*

I have been asked several times to suggest a good counter-emet for those who have by some mischance read too many war books of what may be called the Coningsby Dawson School—"The Glory of the Trenches," "The Cross at the Front," and the rest. In these unfortunate cases I always

recommend as a sure corrective an excellent little volume called "Attack," by Captain E. G. D. Liveing, of the British Army, published last year by the Macmillan Company. As John Masefield says in his brief introduction, "it is a simple and most vivid account of a modern battle. No better account has been written in England since the war began." Let me give a taste of Captain Liveing's quality. He has been badly wounded and is awaiting his turn for treatment at the clearing station:

"Shells, high explosives and shrapnel, were coming over every now and then. I kept my helmet well over my head. This also served as a shade from the sun, for it was now about ten o'clock and a sultry day. I was able to obtain a view of events round about fairly easily. From time to time orderlies tramped through the archway, bearing stretcher-cases to the dug-out. Another officer had been brought in and placed on the opposite side of the archway. The poor fellow, about nineteen, was more or less unconscious. His head and both hands were covered in bandages crimson with blood. So coated was he with mud and gore that I did not at first recognize him as an officer. At the farther end of the arch a young private of about eighteen was lying on his side, groaning in the agony of a stomach wound and crying "Mother." The sympathetic "padre" did the best he could to comfort him. Out in the road the men of the Royal Army Medical Corps were dressing and bandaging the ever-increasing flow of wounded. Amongst them a captive German army medical man, in green uniform with a Red Cross round his sleeve, was visible, hard at work. Everything seemed so different from the deadly strife a thousand or so yards away. There, foe was inflicting wounds on foe, here were our men attending to the German wounded and the Germans attending to ours. Both sides were working so hard now to save life. There was a human touch about that scene in the ruined village street which filled one with a sense of mingled sadness and pleasure. Here were both sides united in a common attempt to repair the ravages of war. Humanity had at last asserted itself."

Fortunately, this book, with its rare qualities of simple truthfulness and freedom from any vestige of hate and self-righteousness, is not under the ban of either our civil or military authorities, nor I imagine is it likely to be, possessing as it does the approval of so distinguished a British propagandist as Mr. Masefield. By the way, I should like to know Captain Liveing's opinion of our patrioteers who used to demand that "we should hack our way through to Berlin." I have no doubt that he would express himself in terms both "simple and most vivid."

"So, too, the great petroleum fields of Tampulipas and Vera Cruz are of little real benefit to Mexico. They increase the business of Tampico; they furnish labor to a certain number of hands; they produce a valuable material for world use; they make fortunes for a few American and English speculators; but they contribute little to Mexico's upbuilding; they lead to political corruption, to local unrest and disturbance, to meddling and interference, to constant threat of intervention."—*Professor Frederick Starr, of the University of Chicago, in the American Journal of Sociology, Sept. 1918.*

I see that the Union of Democratic Control in England at a meeting on November 2d passed the following resolution:

"That in the opinion of this Union all fear of German military operations in Russia having been removed, no pretext remains for the occupation of Russia by Allied troops, whose continued presence there can now only be an unwarrantable interference in Russian domestic affairs."

THE ROADMENDER.

The New Penitence

RICHARD ROBERTS

A MAIDEN lady of London, a woman of blameless life, much interested in Sunday schools and foreign missions, one morning found herself pilloried in a newspaper as an accomplice in the unspeakable brutalities which had accompanied the collection of rubber in a South American valley. The poor lady, of course, knew nothing of her offence. She had doubtless been told that rubber was proving a good investment and had in good faith put some money into a rubber company. But are we to say that her ignorance exonerated her from moral responsibility?

This is an instructive instance of the way in which modern commerce has complicated the problems of conduct. In the old days, before the inventions which have well nigh abolished distance, it was a comparatively simple matter to determine the range and character of one's moral obligations. This is not to say that they were not beset with difficulty. But these very difficulties were embraced for most people within the parish bounds. But now that commerce has gone forth astride the steam engine to the uttermost ends of the earth so that its ramifications cover the habitable globe with a fine drawn network, it becomes virtually impossible to trace an investment through its various applications until it returns in the form of interest. The check one signs in payment for shares in a Nigerian tin-mine has consequences far beyond our power to anticipate or to follow; and it is impossible for us to disown responsibility for the process that our check sets afoot. The frontiers of our moral problems stretch out today beyond the parish bounds to the farthest sky-line.

But our problems are not only complicated by the shrinkage of the world, but by the high degree of specialization which has been attained in modern industry. In the old days, when one bought a coat, one could trace the main processes which eventuated in the coat to their various sources with comparative ease; but nowadays not only do we bring our wool from Australia, or import our cloth from Yorkshire, but the processes which produce the thread, the needles, the buttons and all the rest are ever endless in their minuteness and

variety. And it is impossible to secure any guarantee that at some point or other of the process there has not been sweating or underpayment or unhygienic conditions of work. Some years ago the English Christian Social Union used to publish a "white list" of shops in which one might trade with a good conscience; but the very complexity of modern industrial conditions and processes has proved the very doubtful utility of this expedient, and the list is (I believe) no longer published. The plain truth is that there is no moment of our life that we do not involve ourselves in complicity in social and industrial conditions of which we can know nothing and form no judgment. But our ignorance does not absolve us from responsibility for our share in creating and perpetuating them.

And in their consequences, too. This is not the place to show how directly the slum emerges from the prevailing commercial and industrial system, nor how the saloon is its necessary and inevitable sequel. But there is no question as to the connection. And whatever of immorality, infant mortality, and crime follow from these conditions must be regarded as social sins involving a collective guilt. It is part of our failure in the treatment of the criminal that we neglect to remember that we are all together responsible for the conditions which have helped to create him; and until we think of him less as a wilful miscreant than as a symptom of organic social disorder, we shall never reach the true perspective for our penology. Similarly, to say dark and stormy things about the I. W. W. and other forms of industrial unrest is simply to overlook the rather obvious fact that the causes for phenomena of this kind have their sources in the inequities and the inhumanities of the social order, for the existence of which we are all responsible, whether by direct or indirect participation in it or any easy toleration of it.

A Revision of Modern Ideas

The situation then is simply this: World-wide commercial expansion on the one hand and competitive large scale production on the other have produced a wide and close social integration which requires a thorough-going revision of our conventional moral ideas. It is no longer possible to con-

ceive of sin in simple terms of personal delinquency; nor is it possible for us to extricate ourselves one by one from the common responsibility. We must somehow contrive a theological standpoint which embraces this new fact. These vast sociological processes have been going on at a pace much greater than the co-ordination of moral ideas to correspond with them. Our popular ethics still belong to the age before the railroad; and the growing demand that preaching should sound a "social note" is hardly more than a confession that we are still handling moral problems on the basis of a moral individualism which has ceased to have reality in the modern world. It is not enough at this time of day that we should call individuals to repentance or gather up the gospel into an offer of a personal salvation. This assuredly we ought to do,—but not to leave the other undone.

But what is the other? It is, to put it very summarily, the task of evoking a public compunction for social wrongs. It is true that the pulpit has for many years been increasingly sensitive to the need of some such movement as this. But it has laboured under the double disadvantage of insufficient acquaintance with social fact and of the lack of agreement among those who have specialized upon the subject concerning the principles of a sound social polity. Nor are we yet in a position to say that this disadvantage no longer exists. The result is that such social passion as has been evoked has been directed to the service of a palliative philanthropy, to the endeavor for the humanization of existing conditions. This is indeed all to the good; and an amount and a quality of devotion have been put into this labor which is altogether admirable. But while we are alleviating the pain and dressing the sores, the springs of the evil go on unchecked. Not until we quicken a public compunction vivid and impelling enough to drive men's consciences and intelligences to the study of the causes of social wrong and to stimulate in them a radical effort to remove these causes shall we make the contribution we ought to social reclamation. Our task is to set afoot a mass-movement for the redemption of society,—to quicken a religious revival charged with a strong and positive social vision.

In effect, that would be a revival of New Testament Christianity. By what strange accident (one wonders) has Christian preaching ever come

to lack what is called the "social note"? The New Testament is charged with it from cover to cover. The disciples were first called Christians in Antioch; and the quality which gained them that distinction is plain from the two things that are said about them,—that they made a collection for their famine-stricken brethren in Judæa and that they sent out messengers to break the bread of life to the famine-stricken heathen world. They were, that is, people of a wide and compelling social vision. So also were the company in the Upper Room who were so aware of a new intensity and quality of social demand that they made an experiment in communism. And when the New Testament apocalypticist describes the consummation of all things, he dramatises a social vision. The New Testament ethic is governed by the thought of what the late Josiah Royce called "the great community"; and the New Testament itself becomes a strangely self-verifying document when it is read in the light of this thought. Its emphasis is consistently upon the society-making virtues, the graces of social healing and integration; even our most direct definition of salvation is given in social terms. To Zacchæus, salvation was adoption into a family, initiation into a society. "For this day salvation hath come to this house; forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham." And so Zacchæus felt it to be, for he immediately began to act as a member of the family should. Forthwith he set about such social acts as were then and there within his power,—charity and restitution. Even this exploiter of the poor had had a social vision which turned him inside out. May we not say that the Christian salvation is an affair of transforming social vision and that the real test of a man's salvation is what power and what manner of social vision he has?

A Wider Definition of Sin

This, of course, involves consequences for our definition of sin. As things are, the word, when it does not cover a purely metaphysical abstraction, is used as a generic term for the grosser offences against social decency, theft, drunkenness, sensuality and the like. Both these uses are legitimate, of course. But the word needs to be expanded to cover every kind of unsocial or anti-social act. The divine order for human life is mutuality, reciprocity, call it what you will; and sin is anything which violates this order. The share

that I hold in a company which exploits a "half-brain" tribe in the interest of its investors involves me in sin; I am guilty of complicity in an anti-social activity; and even though I do no more than tolerate the system which makes such things possible, I am still guilty. For like St. Paul at Stephen's martyrdom I stand by consenting. That we participate or acquiesce in an order which permits the enslavement and the impoverishment of men and women for the profit and pleasure of others makes us sinners in a direct and authentic sense. The church has always held schism to be deadly sin; we must also learn that they who have any share in promoting the multiform schism which rends human society are in the same condemnation.

All this involves a certain change in the practice of penitence, or at least in our sense of it.

The sins that you do in two by two,

You must answer for one by one;

and in the end the sins that we commit in masses we must answer for in the same way. There will never be a corporate compunction for social wrong until there is a personal compunction for corporate sin. We are caught in the toils of a system which involves us in personal responsibility for wrongs which we are personally incapable of righting. And until we feel this impotency as an intolerable heart-breaking strain we have not reached the beginnings of the only dynamic that will effect a social redemption. Isaiah has some dim sense of this socially-contracted guilt. "I am a man of unclean lips and dwell among a people of unclean lips." And our penitence is not going to be adequate even for our own personal absolution until it has absorbed this poignant social quality.

Yet this has its compensation in Christian experience. For it will enable us to attain to a new realization of our own personal priesthood. The essential quality of the priest is that he bears the sin and the sorrows of his fellows in sacrifice and intercession before God; and the true priest is he who goes to the altar not in the spirit of a formal vicariousness, but as one touched to the quick by the sin of his brethren as by his own, and who bears it all in his own heart as he offers himself to God. The time needs Christian men and women who are able in a very real sense to bear the sin of the world, and to supply what is behind of the afflictions of Christ. To share the fellowship of His sufferings, and especially of the su-

preme suffering of being made sin for us, this is the note of the true Christian soul—yes, and its longing and desire.

The State and the Individual

Now that the war is over it ought to be possible for those who object to the right of the state to conscript men's lives and to control their acts to receive a dispassionate hearing of their case. While the war was on any attempt at explanation or justification was dismissed with impatience, even with anger, but now it is beginning to be seen that a clear understanding of this basic issue is vital in the coming days of reconstruction.

The recent trial of Roger N. Baldwin has called public attention to certain modern aspects of this old problem of the relation of the individual to the state. Roger Baldwin refused to report himself for physical examination and gave himself up to the Department of Justice, whereupon he was sentenced by Federal Judge Mayer to one year's imprisonment for failure to comply with the Selective Service Law. The proceedings in court were unusually impressive. Prisoner and Judge spoke to each other like free and honorable men, without bitterness or passion. Their remarks have been published in a pamphlet which may be had for the price of postage (three cents) from Mr. Albert de Silver, 41 Union Square, New York City.

This case serves but to place a fresh emphasis on the question which has long plagued church and state; is imprisonment the best answer to heresy? Must the modern state for her own safety, like the ancient church with the same motive, put idealists, even mistaken idealists, to the torture—for our prisons are places of torture never doubt? In the case of Roger Baldwin the state has taken a man of national reputation in the best and most urgent forms of social work, a member of several important committees doing constructive service of the utmost value, and for disobedience to its fiat shut him up in a country jail for one whole year. His time and his experiences there will not be wasted, nevertheless the question remains, are such men as he so common, so unwanted, that the state can jail them for long periods with such indifference? When the state says to a man, "you must do this," is it ensuring that society will receive the best possible service? If prison is intended to punish and to reform offenders, just how will it function in cases like Roger Baldwin's?

We refer at some length to this case because it in no way differs from that of several hundred other men guilty of a similar offence to Roger Baldwin's, except that he is almost alone in receiving so light a sentence. These men cannot be called slackers or cowards. They have not sought to avoid in the hundred and one ways that were open to them a fate which all who know the facts would agree, is worse and harder to bear than service in the army. They have in fact voluntarily accepted the consequences of their decisions without hate or bitterness or with any spirit of self-glorifying martyrdom.

It is well worth our while trying to understand such men, and to seek for a principle of fellowship with them which will remove once and for all the great illusion that the heretic to the state is an enemy of humanity.

The Open Forum

From a Jewish Reader

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

I have drawn a great deal of inspiration and enlightenment from your paper, for which I sincerely wish you the greatest success in every way. Of course I am not a Christian in the ecclesiastical sense, and I don't think Christianity as an ecclesiastical system has been a success—perhaps because Christianity as a religion has never really been given a chance. But however that may be, I think we can clasp hands on our common ideal of a world in which peace and righteousness shall reign.

New York City.

H. H.

In Defence of Force

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

Permit me to say in reply to Mr. Pinkham's letter in your issue for November that sound social and political science, philosophy, and ethics know no essential distinction between the actions and responsibilities of individuals and collectivities. That there is such a distinction has long been the thesis of neopagan Germanism on the one hand and of anarchism on the other; but this view has steadily been combated by both Christianity and social science. The tendency of our courts of law, as well as of our political science and sociology has been to regard human groups in their relations and activities as quasi-personalities.

Mr. Pinkham is mistaken in saying that our federal government has no right to employ force in coercing a State or a whole community by force. Our Civil War surely settled that question. As a matter of fact, force stands behind the mandates of the federal government when it deals with the States or communities as much as when it deals with individuals; and our State governments not infrequently coerce by force cities, counties, and lesser communities within their borders. This is not saying, of course, that force is the sole or even the main foundation of our political organization. The League of Nations should be modeled upon our federal system; but just as a State that set aside the mandates of our Supreme Court or of federal authority would soon find itself threatened by coercion, so a nation that set aside the mandates of the supreme court of such a League should find itself likewise threatened, if the League is to have any practical power in international relations. When, therefore, a man like Mr. J. A. Hobson sets himself to working out a practicable plan for "an international police force," it is absurd to think that he is playing into the hands of militarists.

Again police power is not directed solely against individuals within a State. When the police are called upon to dispel a mob—say, a lynching party—their efforts are directed, not against the few leaders who are probably guilty of inciting the whole lawless action—but against the whole mob, as a collectivity. There is such a thing as *collective* responsibility.

Finally, Mr. Pinkham would surely not deny the right to revolution by force on the part of a people. Yet what is this but one class using force against another, that is, against a collectivity? While such an action should be a last resort, yet in the case of a semi-criminal governing class oppressing the people, few would deny its justice. But it is as hard to draw an indictment against a whole class as against a whole people. There are always plenty of innocent individuals in either. The point is, one is responsible not only for one's own actions, but also for those with whom one is closely associated—both in law and in morals.

The best study to show both the use and the limits of force in human society is criminology. Now, criminology undoubtedly shows that the old idea that we can get rid of crime and

of the criminal by the use of repressive force is wrong. It has discredited the old idea of retaliation and even the newer one of reformation by force. But it does show that a certain amount of force is still necessary to stop the criminal in his career and to place him in an environment where regenerative influences may have an opportunity to work upon him. And the essential principles of criminology are as applicable to collectivities as to individuals.

The conclusion of the whole matter, then is this, Force in order to be employed rightly in human society must be in the hands of love and rationality; but on the other hand, good-will and rationality in order to be effective must organize material energies, that is, be backed by force. This may be Utopian, but it is the only conclusion science will admit of.

Columbia, Missouri.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD.

The Unreality of Our Sects

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

I believe Stephen Lowrie has properly analyzed our political party situation in your issue of November. Surely there can be no doubt about the need of a "new alignment." May I venture to suggest likewise a need for a new alignment in church affiliation. How many men and women weekly falsify themselves by reciting a creed in which they do not believe; manipulate formulæ of liturgy which to them are meaningless, or listen to a presentation of religion in which they find no help. Why should they not worship where they can partake "in spirit and in truth," where they insist upon and help produce reality. On the other hand, full many a so-called Quaker is fundamentally a "creedalist" in his religious make-up, and demands a priest to direct his worship for him and is able to approach God only through form. Why should he be called upon to deny himself the satisfying of his religious needs, or else be allowed to so temper the group of which he is a part as to make it lose its *raison d'être*.

Certain religious groups were born in the spirit of social reconstruction. They were radicals looking for a new day. Why should such groups cater to the loyalty of conservatives and members who have no social vision and thereby lose their forward look.

Do we foster too much loyalty to a "machine" or organization; too little loyalty to conviction; a vision, a message. The call of the age is for personality, individuals first and then institutions. Might not some closer affiliation between denominations, each developing more distinctly their peculiar field of thought and belief, at the same time each recognizing more readily the value and place of the other, be wholesome. A church without principles can no more succeed than can political parties without principles. This would, of course, entail a more ready transfer of membership from one group to another, but would, I believe, lend itself to a far more effective church—a church with a message, delivering that message, and at the same time recognizing the worth and value of all other groups.

Oskaloosa, Iowa.

C. P.

Against Reversing Our Slogans

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

I have to thank you for the clearest light on the Russian situation that I have found in any publication coming to my notice. I have tried to keep mentally balanced under the broadside of horrors that the press of this country, and of the world, has spread before us and called "Russia." My mind would not let me condemn the Soviet atrocities—(many of which I felt intuitively went no further back than the desks of certain

press correspondents) or even the bloodshed, at which my whole being revolted, because I knew not how much of it was true, and how much of it was utterly and cruelly false. Now comes from a friend a copy of your August issue containing Norman Thomas' second letter to Stevenson, and your September number with his remarkable article "The Acid Test of Our Democracy" which confirms my position not only to myself, but also to some of my friends whose minds have been poisoned almost beyond belief by the daily newspapers, and by some of the so-called liberal journals. I am now looking for you to elucidate various governmental condemnations of "wholesale Russian atrocities"—yet to be *proved*! It seems that few people relate these hypocritical protests, with Allied intervention in Russia in the interests of a "bigger program now being worked out in a practical way." What interest (or interests) dictated this program? How is it being worked out, and what part are our American troops to play to this end? Is our slogan of Democracy against Autocracy to be reversed, after serving the purposes of those who willed our participation in the war?

Another thing, may not the judgment of Mr. Thomas be questioned regarding the so-called "denial of suffrage" to certain classes? Why use the negative phraseology especially when it depends on hearsay not on facts? Rather let us say, here is a government that makes *labor* a prerequisite of suffrage. After centuries of more or less limited suffrage in a civilization in which *property* qualification has long existed—and still exists—cannot the world endure for a time a much more just and reasonable qualification—labor qualification—until such time as the abolition of class privilege everywhere shall sweep away even this manifestation of it? Can we ask from the new order what we had no reason to expect from the old? This is a point of view that I feel will come to you later. I only anticipate your clear vision.

CAROLIN B. TOWNER.

Boston, Massachusetts.

Let Us Know the Truth About Russia

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

I have been disappointed not to see in your columns any praise of the splendid articles dealing with the Russian situation that you have published during the summer and fall. It is rare indeed to find an editor who sees that "the correct solution of the Russian problem overshadows in importance all else that is happening throughout the world." Events immediately preceding and following the declaration of peace have not made this contention any less true. The birth of the great Russian democracy is at once the most glorious and the most tragic event that has occurred throughout the whole period of the war. And yet perhaps never in history has any human achievement deserved more and received less of understanding and sympathy and support; and deserved less and received more of criticism and vilification and hate. I might add of *fear*, too, for it is fear that has created the hate; and the deeper the fear, the stronger must be the hate.

I want to ask for a little of your space in which to plead for a suspension of judgment in regard to the Bolsheviks and the Soviet government. The violence of the anti-Bolshevism of our newspapers must, before very long, prove self-defeating. We are going to realize after a little, that with the overthrow of the Kaiser and his war lords has gone the war-time psychology of hate. But we must beware of the hate that is being fanned into flame by a number of powerful groups throughout the world.

Is it not time for us to begin to do a little thinking on our own account about Russia? Let us try to realize that the new Russia is a promise and a hope, not a blunder or a crime. Let us demand that we be told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Let us know what Raymond Robins brought

back with him from Russia, as well as what Mr. Hearst's representative, Edward Sisson, discovered there. We may well ask ourselves whether there must not be some few grains of truth in the reports of men and women of such widely different temperaments as Albert Williams and Colonel Thatcher; Arthur Ransome and Colonel Thompson; John Reed and Raymond Robins; Madeline Doty, Louise Bryant, Bessie Beatty and Prof. A. E. Ross—trustworthy men and women all, whose accounts of conditions in Russia give the lie to 99 per cent of newspaper puerilities and inventions.

Who knows but that some of us may yet come to pray to be forgiven for our unthinking credulity and unworthy suspicions!

New York City.

BLANCHE WATSON.

Rebuilding on Sand or Rock?

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

From among the discord and confusion of the great war, this fact is increasingly more apparent, that the old order is outgrown, that a new order must replace the old. Now in the first days of the reconstruction, changes are being effected almost over night which are the result of the culminative efforts of generations of revolutionaries and reformers.

The world war was no accident. It was an inevitable result of the old order. If we would insure a future without wars, we must go back of the issues arising from the war and ferret out the misconceptions which made this war inevitable. Thoughtful and observing men and women in all lands have already hunted down and exposed these old misconceptions to the world. They are called by such names as militarism, jingoism, capitalism. Before the new age can be successful, these forces must be mastered or destroyed. Programs have been put forth for abolishing these mighty evils, but without a change from the spirit on which the old order grew up and thrived, no program can abolish the old militarism, the old commercialism, or any of the old isms which for years have doomed the world to war and pestilence and famine. Mankind has built his civilization on his convenience, his pleasure, his control of nature, or on some other foundations calculated to gratify his vanity or lust—and when the winds and the floods came, that civilization inevitably fell.

In the new age that is dawning, man must build not on any selfish desire, not even merely on economic justice—he must build on a universal spiritual love and brotherhood. It is time now to realize that the very fundamental idea of the old order was wrong, that it glorified those primitive passions of the brute which man must outgrow if his civilization is to remain. Now is the time to realize that the measure of a civilization is not found in any matter of physical show, but in the souls of its humanity. Christ's life and his teachings, freed from all theological implications, give us the bases of a successful reconstruction and a permanent civilization.

The democracy of the new order must be based on the philosophy of the Sermon on the Mount. There is only one way in which the world can assure itself of a permanent peace, and that way is the establishing of the law of love above every human law. To the extent that our new order is built on force, is built on money, is built on machinery, is built on anything except the ruling purpose of establishing in man's every-day life, the principles of Jesus—to that extent will the new order be temporary and doomed.

All the old forms and physical standards, including those of religious forms and ceremonies, have been tried and found wanting. Two courses remain. Again we may build our house in the old way, on the old sands of delusion—and again will that house collapse in entire ruin on our own heads. Or we may utterly cast from us the old spirit of creed and clan and claw, and begin a new mode of life, based on those universal truths declared and lived by Christ. Then only shall we build on the rock.

AVERY WEAGE.

Seattle, Washington.

Russia Still the Acid Test

WASHINGTON, November 21.—News of the coup at Omsk, by which Admiral Kolchak virtually has become dictator of the all-Russian forces, is regarded at the State Department as another sign pointing to stabilization of the movement relied upon to regenerate Russia. The great weakness in the situation in Siberia, it has been believed for some time, is the lack of a powerful head of the Government *who cannot be swayed by popular demonstrations and who will work toward the reconstruction of the Government with a firm hand.* Admiral Kolchak is thought to be a man who will not misuse his authority, and whose hostility toward the Bolshevik elements which have led to the country's disruption is strong.—(The italics are ours.)

This despatch, which appeared in the New York *Evening Post* on November 21, under the heading, "Washington is pleased," is, we believe, the most revealing statement yet published about Russia. Gone is all pretense that we favor a "democratic government" against "Bolshevik tyranny." "Washington," unless it is terribly maligned, actually rejoices in a military *coup d'état* and the establishment of a dictatorship! Proof of this same attitude of mind in Great Britain is given by the London *Nation* of October 19. We quote

"The strange letter from Mr. Kerensky to the *Daily News* would have attracted sharp attention at any other time. We knew that he had been forbidden to go to America. It now appears that our Foreign Office has forbidden him to return to Russia. That one fact, we fear, blows away the whole pretence that the future of Russia is in the hands of the moderate Left parties [i. e., Socialist, but not Bolshevik], who were the majority of the Constituent Assembly. If Kerensky may not return to work with them, the inference is that we desire the leadership of very different elements. What are these? Mr. Kerensky states that a financier active in the Kornilov movement, is now, under an assumed name going and coming freely, in enjoyment of military rank, between England and Russia. Is the inference that the Allied influences which openly backed the Kornilov adventure, are now again promoting some similar military dictatorship, resting presumably on some dubious financial deal? That is what Mr. Kerensky suggests. Under the present veil of secrecy anything may be happening. The little that leaks out is more than disquieting."

In other words, even Kerensky, the foe of Bolshevism, is not conservative enough to please the Allies. What are we to think of all this? Is it possible that America is to uphold a military dictatorship which will open Russia to economic imperialism and guarantee the payment of the enormous foreign debt piled up under the corrupt tyranny of the Tsars? It would seem so if all we hear be true.

Yet even now the situation is not hopeless. We cannot believe that the people either of Britain or America who went to war for "the rights of small nations" are willing to see revolution crushed by dictators. We must voice at once in every city throughout the land, in mass meetings and in the public press, our demand that in Russia, too, "men must have the right to choose their way of life and obedience."

A great new opportunity has come to America to prove by her dealings with Russia the sincerity of her professed principles.

The military and naval power of Germany has vanished. The treaties forced by the German war lords on the Russian Soviet Government are as if they had not been made. The character of their Government is the best possible guarantee that the German people no longer seek imperialistic dominance over the territories of their neighbors. Like the Russians, they have adopted a new orientation. What possible justification, then, is left for the Allies and America to maintain troops on Russian soil or to intrigue with would-be dictators? It is no justification to talk of the tyranny of the Bolsheviks. Whatever their faults may be, they will not be cured by alien armies. *The World Tomorrow* holds no brief for the Russian "Reds"; we have consistently denounced terrorism in these pages, whether "red" or "white." Yet we are constrained to say that the most trustworthy reports we have seen clear the Bolshevik government of many of the worst charges against it. For example, from certain relief workers, not themselves pro-Bolshevik, who have recently arrived in this country, we learn that Allied and American intervention added fuel to the fire of terrorism. From the same trustworthy authorities we learn that the Czechs and other nondescript forces have executed more prisoners in Siberia than have the Bolsheviks. Such reports as these we earnestly hope will receive the most serious attention of our government.

Regardless of details, certain things are obvious to the most superficial student of Russian affairs:

1. The Soviet experiment in industrial democracy and the organization of a State expressive of a new order in economic life is the most profoundly significant act in the drama of human history since the French Revolution—possibly since the Reformation.¹ We do not doubt that like its great precursors it has been guilty of much blundering and many crimes. But the worst crime of all would be to crush a great movement for freedom because of fear of revolution.

2. The root principle of American democracy at its best has been "that good government cannot take the place of self-government." It is a tragic contradiction of this fundamental truth for the Allies to maintain an army on Russian soil in an attempt to determine for the Russians what kind of government they ought to have. In Vladivostok the Allied forces threw into jail all the Bolshevik City Councillors, who had been elected by an overwhelming majority of the citizens.² Shall we permit this outrage to be repeated throughout Russia in the sacred name of "democracy"? If the Bolsheviks have maintained their power solely through German aid they will be quickly turned out of office and supplanted by some other party. But this would not necessarily affect the Soviet form of government. Is not the very fact that this amazing experiment has endured for more than a year in face of such tremendous difficulties *prima facie* proof of its vitality and strength?

3. The social and property interests alike of Russian bourgeoisie and of vast numbers of foreign bondholders are bound up in the restoration of the old economic order in Russia. These

¹ See John Reed's article on the Soviets at work in the August number of *The Liberator*.

² See Albert Rhys Williams' story of what he saw in Vladivostok in *The New Republic* for November 9, 1918.

interests have at their back the instinctive sympathy of capitalism everywhere. Their influence upon governments from China to Peru is enormous and it is seldom altogether disinterested. All the sources of news—except the truth—are in the hands of these interests. The stories from Russia that see the light of day in our newspapers seem almost as if they had passed through the hands of a skilled committee on public misinformation. Take for example the case of the recent "Massacre of the Middle Classes" arranged for by the Bolsheviki for November 10. A religious meeting in New York was so credulous as to pass a resolution calling on our Government to demand of the German Kaiser (save the mark!) as a condition of peace that he prevent this atrocity. What happened? We quote from the New York *World* for November 12th:

"The Soviet Council in Petrograd has adopted a resolution giving amnesty to all arrested hostages and persons alleged to be involved in plots against the Soviets, except those whose detention is necessary as a guaranty for the security of the Bolsheviki who have fallen into enemy hands."

But—and here is the despicable villainy of it all—the lie was a front page story in all the papers, the truth gets a few lines on an inside page in one!

Who will dare say that the facts do not justify a demand for

the withdrawal of our armies from Russia and the substitution of a policy of famine-relief and economic aid by which millions of human beings may be saved alive through the long winter?

Our national dealings with revolutionary Russia almost from the beginning have been a sad commentary alike on our intelligence, our idealism and our independence. It is some comfort to think that in some respects at least we have been much better than our Allies. Probably we may justly thank President Wilson for having exerted somewhat of a restraining influence upon more ambitious plans of military intervention. We wish that he had made clear explanations of the situation from time to time as occasion called for public information and counsel. But we may remember his Mexican policy, his general idealism and his caution in the employment of American forces and take hope that he has not forgotten his democratic principles in this testing time. Now is the moment for him to translate that hope into assurance; to end temporizing policies, and to denounce—not applaud—still less support a dictator "who cannot be swayed by popular demonstration."

As we deal with Russia we are likely to deal with the new Germany. In our action in both countries will be found evidence whether the League of Nations is to become another and unholy Holy Alliance or the glorious fulfillment of the dreams of the idealists.

Is Christianity Worth Saving?—A Communication

ONE of the most interesting phenomena of this generation is the appearance of an articulate group of Christians who believe that a profession of Christianity carries with it a general acceptance of Jesus' attitude toward life. For the courage and sincerity of these men and women we can have nothing but admiration; if anything could render Christianity worthy of respect, it would be their interpretation and living of it, but it is well nigh heart-breaking to see them wasting on the effort to rehabilitate a discredited name, energies that might be turned to purposes infinitely more worth while.

Nothing could be further from the writer's mind than to impugn anyone's right to attend Church on Sundays or to call himself a Christian, if it gives him any comfort to do so. What is impugned is the claim that everyone who agrees generally with the attitude of Jesus must accept an historically incorrect interpretation of the terms "Christian" and "Christianity."

The assignment of a clear and definite meaning to the word "Christianity" is of practical importance. Success in an attempt to give to the words "Christianity" and "Christian" the significance desired by *The World Tomorrow* is both impossible and undesirable, for it would render unintelligible nearly everything that has been written on Christian history and Christian theology. It may be regrettable that "Christianity" and "Christian" should have come to mean what they do, but the same is true of "charity" and "charitable." "Live wires" in the twentieth century, however, have something better to do than to spend their lives in sentimental regrets over etymological "might have beens."

The word "Christianity" has not for centuries had in general usage the slightest reference to the teachings of Jesus. The

"Christianity of Jesus" is a misnomer, for Jesus satisfied none of the recognized requirements for Christian fellowship. He was in the opinion of the "best citizens" of his time a highly, unpatriotic, blasphemous and class conscious working man. He spoke kindly of Samaritans and even of the heathen, which was almost as bad as admitting today that Germans have been pre-eminent in music, philosophy or science. His comments upon the shew bread and upon the highly respectable Pharisees with their habit of making the word of God of none effect through their tradition are more suggestive of an I. W. W. hymn book than of the decorously meaningless exercises which we call Christian worship. Questions and discussions were the rule at his meetings and we owe some of his greatest utterances to his willingness to be heckled. A "Rev." Jesus, wearing a clerical coat and a "backward-looking" collar is unthinkable. The love of Jesus for his kind was practically limited to the proletariat and to outcasts from the upper classes. Christian love, on the other hand, includes nearly everybody but the proletariat, which is regarded as fit only for the attentions of the "social worker." Jesus was tried and convicted of sedition, and the qualities he denounced in the Pharisees are precisely those which are most strikingly characteristic of the sleek successes whose overpowering presence makes the average Christian Church about as home-like to a working man as Jesus himself found the Temple at Jerusalem at the time of his encounter with the money changers.

No honest person can urge that the conditions of Christianity just mentioned are simply the result of the failure of poor human nature to live up to its ideals. Christians cannot have it both ways. If they wish to attribute Christianity to the Christian Church or to any other of the institutions known to us as

Christian, they cannot talk about the "Christianity of Jesus."

Lastly just a word on "Christian doctrine." The Atonement is the central doctrine of "Christianity," but we shall look vainly in the parable of the prodigal son for any hint that the father had to punish a substitute to satisfy his "justice" before he could greet the returning prodigal. "The Lord's Supper" is the central Christian sacrament, but beyond a casual request (the authenticity of which is more doubtful than most other things in the first three gospels) addressed to his twelve disciples, there is nothing in Jesus' teaching to justify the importance attached to it; and as now being administered, whether by Catholic or Protestant, it serves a purpose entirely different from that indicated in Jesus' request, if ever made.

Then Christianity has always regarded itself as bound up with theological conformity. It has waged bloody wars and maintained the most savage persecutions in recorded history over details of ritual and interpretation. Jesus was notoriously indifferent to such matters and gave great offence by his contempt for them. Christianity asserts, for the most part, that the Will of God as apprehended by the individual believer must be subordinated to the will of the government of the country in which the Christian lives. Jesus was crucified for maintaining a precisely opposite view.

Because they would like the history of Christianity to have been different, believers in the "religion of Jesus" cannot wipe out the facts of nineteen centuries and on the strength of their admiration for Jesus, proclaim themselves the only Christians. Not only historically, but as a matter of contemporary experience, they are anti-Christian, rather than non-Christian. Their fellow Christians realize this and are acting accordingly. Their spiritual and intellectual affinities are all anti or non-Christian, yet for the sake of retaining a name to which they have no right, they condemn themselves, for practical purposes, to a barren isolation.

Wellesley, Massachusetts.

W. T. COLYER.

EDITORIAL NOTE: We publish this challenging communication from Mr. Colyer, because it represents a criticism which, in one form or another, is growing more and more outspoken and insistent. Many letters from our readers reflect it. Ministers of all denominations are conscious of a new and different and far more critical attitude of men everywhere toward their creeds and dogmas. Only the other day this commonplace criticism was voiced by a man prominent in the public life of America who declared that it was the greatest irony of history that the Christian church had called itself after the name of Jesus of Nazareth. There are moods, we venture to say, in which many Christians, leading members of our churches, would echo this comment. And there stands out clearly the simple fact that in the gospels which it has preserved and less completely in the life it inspires, Christianity continually presents men with the very standard by which some of its critics so sweepingly condemn it and kindles in some of its disciples the flame which seeks to burn away the dross. Is this service of no account? As a matter of actual observation, therefore, is it not true that Christianity is used in two very different senses; first, as a comprehensive word for the various systems of religion held by the churches, and second, as a spirit and attitude toward life, toward God and our fellow man, and toward the great ultimate problems of "time, and fate and death"—a spirit and attitude which derive their inspiration from Jesus of Nazareth? It surely will not have escaped Mr. Colyer's notice how often and how approvingly the word Christian is used in this latter sense by those who, not without reason, are most hostile to or-

ganized Christianity. This fact makes us feel that our use of the word in *The World Tomorrow* does not lay us open to such general misunderstanding as Mr. Colyer indicates.

Simply, as a practical matter, is it not well that a group of men and women to whom Christianity means something much more than a name should do all that lies in their power to hold the Church up to its own highest ideals and give reality and significance to a word?

It seems to us that at some points Mr. Colyer's challenging assertions are too dogmatic. He is surely aware that even in the orthodox churches there are men and women who would reject the substitutionary theory of the Atonement as defined by Mr. Colyer as emphatically as even he could wish. Yet these Christians do not fail to see in the life and death of Jesus an event of peculiar significance in the long struggle to overcome evil with good, and in the Cross a very precious symbol of the love of God. For our own part we cannot feel that such a faith condemns us to barren isolation or cuts us off from fellowship with all who seek the truth and love their fellow-men whatever name or sign they bear.—N. T.

The Library

"A Social Theory of Religious Education." By George A. Coe (Scribners. \$1.50 net)

One of the crying needs in the Church of Christ today is for intelligent teachers of Christianity. Much of the failure that is charged to the Church is due to its woeful neglect of education in the modern social interpretation of Christianity. In this timely book Dr. Coe frankly recognizes that this interpretation involves a fundamental change in our educational policies with children as much as with adults.

Dr. Coe believes that just as the theory of education in our public schools is undergoing a transformation, so in Christian education there must be a theory and a practice "in which the love of God to us and our love to him are not separated from, but are realized in, our efforts towards ideal society, the family or kingdom of God." The discussion that follows is based upon the conviction that "there is, or is coming to be, a distinctive religious principle, that of a divine-human industrial democracy," and therefore religious education can no longer be thought of merely as a process by which ancient standards are transmitted, it must have a part in the revision of those standards themselves."

In facing the heroic task of building a world civilization based upon the proposition that all men are brothers, the peculiar significance of the church as educator is seen by Dr. Coe to be two-fold: (1) the comprehensiveness and the revolutionary quality of the principle of human fellowship that the church professes: (2) the church's worship of a common Father.

The Church must "reveal the large sociality that takes in the self-governing state but transcends it" and it must inspire the children with the divine hope and the uncompromising love that shall make possible the renunciation of "the half gods in a great and ultimate faith in Fatherhood and Brotherhood."

Emphatically this book should be in the hands of all who deal with the problems of religious education, as well as of those who would know one of the essential steps toward the New Day.

J. W. D.

The League of Nations: a Discussion

Beginning with this issue THE WORLD TOMORROW will contain each month a section devoted to the discussion of the many problems involved in the establishment and future policies of a League of Nations. In these special pages will appear articles dealing with various aspects of the League together with news and notes regarding the progress of the movement throughout the world. Space will also be given to the publication of letters and the answering of inquiries from our correspondents. We invite the full co-operation of our readers in making this new department really effective.—Editors, "The World Tomorrow."

"People, People, Oh Passionate Host—"

La Democratie est le seul rêve. Mais c'est le rêve des peuples mêmes, ou ce'est rien. (Democracy is the one dream. But it is the dream of the people themselves, or it is nothing.)

*The peoples walk in their nations,
They run, they kneel, they fight.
We say: "Now give them a chance to grow.
Let in upon them light.
Deliver them from the tyrant's rule,
Deliver them from the fox, the fool,
Champion those, teach mercy to these,
Silence the base who sit at ease
And coin another man's loyalties.
Give them the magic of new relations."*

Peoples, who walk in the nations,
Now it will never be
That any can give you a chance to grow
Or a light that will make you see.
Deep in the air the glories pour,
You alone can let them through.
From the first of the world this truth was true:
The people themselves are the peoples' door.
Men will breathe on your mouths in vain,
Useless the passion, useless the pain,

It is you yourselves who yourselves can save,
It is you yourselves who can rise from your grave.
Your graves, they are beds, and a Springtime
Signals the richened soil.
Hear the wind in the world, hear the augural stream,
Oh stir, send up The Dream!
Rise, and be a spirit again!
Death in life is the sovereign crime.
See . . . your children, your towns, your toil,
What are these but the seeds of you?
Seeds are for growing. Let them grow.
Where is your wisdom? Where your sight?
Democracy, liberty, dignity—lo,
These are not given, these are not got,
These are yourselves or they are not.
You run in your nations, you kneel, you fight:
People, people, oh passionate host,
Send up The Dream or the world is lost.
Be freedom, be love, be a star, be the sun,
Be but The Dream and the world is won!

ZONA GALE.

The Progress of the Month

Save the League from the Reactionaries

The modern idea of a League of Nations was advanced originally by liberal writers as providing the only alternative to militarism and ever recurring wars. The establishment of such a league gradually came to be the great idealistic object of the war. The great first difficulty was this: What shall the western democracies do with the world's imperialisms? Should Germany after the war be admitted to the League if she kept her autocratic form of government? But by the miraculous turn of events in the last few weeks that problem no longer presents itself. The question is now what shall we do with our Socialist States like Russia and (in all probability) the Central European nations? We see now that the two great contending forces are not to be political autocracy vs. political democracy—that battle is virtually won—but economic imperialism vs. the social revolution. How then can the nations

be joined in any harmonious league? Between them is a great gulf fixed. Under these circumstances we find that Radicals and Socialists are beginning to be very sceptical of the advantages of a League which is already acclaimed in certain quarters as an excellent device for policing Germany and Russia in the interests of a capitalist system of which it will be the tool and the expression.

We admit the danger, but we would urge against it these considerations: Economic imperialism can work without any formal league through the old frame work of alliances secretly arranged. Imperialism naturally will seek to capture the League, but it will find it imbued with a popular idealism which will make it more inclusive and less cynical and less manageable than the old system of balances of power. Mr. F. A. Hobson in "Democracy After the War" argues with some cogency that any League is better than the continuance

of the absolute power of "closed states" and the burden of armaments they necessarily impose.

For these and other reasons we advocate the League, although we do not expect it to create out of a world half capitalist and half socialist a new heaven and a new earth. The plain task for all of us in these days is to work to make the elements of international fraternity in the League as large as possible, to demand that it shall be based on disarmament and shall concern itself with the vast common interests of the peoples, such as public health, improvement in agriculture, and the protection of undeveloped territories from exploitation and the like. It is along these lines that education and agitation both in America and the Allied countries may be more immediately successful than we think.

The support of the British Premier now added to that of President Wilson makes it almost certain that we shall have a League of some kind. Radical and labor forces we believe will be ill-advised if they oppose the League or stand by with half cynical indifference. It is in their power ultimately to make it a democratic and inclusive federation of peoples.

Where Will America Stand?

Paradoxical as it may seem, at the very time when the end of the war sees the emergence of many new nations, or more accurately old nations freed from the yoke, nationalism as a primary force in the world order has had its day. The great struggles of the epoch we are now entering will be consciously on economic issues. In saying this we do not mean to suggest that nations big or little will disappear. For a time indeed they may be more than ever conscious of themselves. The political principle of internationalism will be federalization not centralization; yet increasingly, national feeling will yield gradually to the sense of solidarity on the one hand of international capital and on the other of the international working class. Men will no longer find real satisfaction for their desires in a mere change of flag or in gaining a certain measure of political freedom. In this fact lies the real meaning of the sweep of social unrest which no national boundaries can confront. It is safe to say that few of those who laughed at Trotsky's appeal to the proletariat of the world in January are laughing at it now in November.

Into this struggle America will enter with the greatest accumulation of wealth and the least developed movement for industrial democracy of all the countries of the world. For a time the majority of our citizens may scarcely be conscious how inevitably America will play the role of the great investing nation. As such without taking a foot of new territory she may exercise economic control over far distant lands and peoples; she may arouse at first the dangerous envy of rival "great powers," and at the last become their leader in resisting the mighty movements of the peoples' will. One escape from this inglorious position is education in the meaning of the new forces which will hold the world's stage and of the nature of the struggle in which they are engaged. We must open our eyes. We must see things as they are. We must know the economic reasons behind the cry for the boycott of German goods, for a high protective tariff, for the greatest navy, and for universal military training. We need to know the truth and to exercise our minds about it. There is much moral sentiment in our country; there is less thought; we cannot do without either.

The League of Free Nations Association

Until very recently we in this country have been in the curious position of having a President who was the chief sponsor among all the statesmen of the world for a democratic League of Nations, while at the same time there has existed no organization to spread a popular understanding of the first principles of such a League. In saying this we have by no means forgotten the League to Enforce Peace. Most of the leaders of that organization stand openly for policies of militarism and economic imperialism, which if carried into effect would either doom the League altogether or, what is even worse, would make it a mighty engine of reaction and oppression. The whole psychology of the "enforcement of peace" would be ludicrous were it not tragic. Peace can grow only out of harmony—and harmony cannot rest upon fear or the threat of superior force.

This elemental principle is fortunately recognized by a new organization called The League of Free Nations Association, to which we extend a cordial welcome. From the very thoughtful and provocative statement of principles issued by this Association we quote the following significant extracts:

"The purposes of such a League of Nations are to achieve for all peoples, great and small:

- (1) Security: the due protection of national existence.
- (2) Equality of economic opportunity.

"Indispensable to the success of American policy are at least the following:

A universal association of nations based upon the principle that the security of each shall rest upon the strength of the whole, pledged to uphold international arrangements giving equality of political right and economic opportunity, the association to be based upon a constitution democratic in character, possessing a central council or parliament as truly representative as possible of all the political parties in the constituent nations, open to any nation, and only such nation, whose government is responsible to the people. The formation of such an association should be an integral part of the settlement itself and its territorial problems, and not distinct therefrom. It should prohibit the formation of minor leagues or special covenants, or special economic combinations, boycotts or exclusions. Differences between members should be submitted to its judicial bodies. Its administrative machinery should be built up from the interallied bodies already in existence, expanded into international bodies differentiated in function and democratized in constitution. The effective sanction of the association shall not be alone the combined military power of the whole used as an instrument of repression, but such use of the world-wide control of economic resources as would make it more advantageous for a State to become and remain a member of the association and to cooperate with it, than to challenge it.

All the principals above outlined are merely an extension of the principles that have been woven into the fabric of our own national life."

The Secretary of this new Association, at 130 West Forty-second Street, New York City, will welcome correspondence. Among the signers of the original statement appear the names of Charles A. Beard, Winston Churchill, Herbert Croly, John Dewey, Learned Hand, Helen Marot, Paul Monroe and Mary Green Simkhovitch.

The Fundamentals of a League of Nations

I & II—Free Trade and National Sovereignty

HENRI LAMBERT

THE author of the following note does not aim to exhaust the subject of the League of Nations. It appears to him that most writers on this question generally lose sight of two of its fundamental aspects. He intends, therefore, to consider briefly these two points, hoping thus to help in elucidating the premises of the problem.

I

The scheme of a League of Nations undoubtedly originates in the conception of "order through might." Those who believe in it apparently think that "order through right" is a utopian ideal. They say to the "utopians": "Consider our national, provincial and municipal commonwealths; within them right is established; do they not all need a police for enforcing order? How can you suppose that order could be kept within a world-commonwealth, without international police possessing powers such as alone could maintain a League of Nations? It will always be true that a force is needed at the service of justice. Right must be backed by might."

On the other hand, the "utopians" answer: "Your very contention implies that right must exist before the might 'backing' it. You, therefore, must at least admit that the condition precedent to the organization of a League of Nations is the establishment of international justice. Moreover, do you not see that the scanty police forces would be incapable of maintaining order within any of our communities if, on the one hand, the immense majority of the community did not pursue their life and behave in all their activities and relations, without any need of a police to 'back' their sense and will of right and morality, and if, on the other hand, the relatively few who have such a need were not themselves constantly restrained by the moral influences that permeate the atmosphere of the community? As soon as this sense and will no longer controls the immense majority, the police forces appear to be powerless against the adverse forces arising from injustice and discontent. It

is less the conception of 'order through right' than that of 'order through might,' that appears to be utopian."

Without immediately taking sides either with or against the partisans of a League of Nations, we may observe that, at any rate, the problem for the future international commonwealth will be to secure order as far as possible through right and therefore with the minimum of might.

Now, it is incontestable that at our epoch of industrial and commercial development, when the progress and welfare of the peoples is fundamentally dependent on their achievements in these domains, it is necessary for the solution of any international problem to commence by creating content and harmony between the legitimate economic interests of the various nations. For individuals and nations alike the economic needs are the vital needs, the economic interests are the fundamental interests, the economic rights are therefore the primary natural rights, and justice and morality in economic intercourse are fundamental justice and morality.

A coalition of nations, no matter in what guise, in order to enforce peace, obviously could not be effective unless based on a sound and solid foundation of satisfied economic interests. Morally, such a coalition would be tolerable only if it had as its object the defense of an *established* regime of international economic justice and morality. Such a regime need not be characterized by an equality of wealth of all nations, but only by an equality of their rights to acquire wealth through production and through free commerce of their products with the whole outside world. It is in this sense and not in that of "possession" that we must understand and give satisfaction to the claim of certain nations to their "place in the sun."

So long as the nations do not enjoy this equality of economic rights and such secured "places in the sun," there will not exist among them that state of fundamental justice and morality which is necessary for the maintenance of order with a minimum of might, or even for justifying and ensuring the substitution of peace for war. War and conquest

will continue to prevail among men as natural phenomena, originating in a natural necessity, in a natural law—exactly as struggle and fighting for food and for life prevail among beasts. Respect of liberty and property and consequent harmony and peace, will be granted to those peoples who have lifted themselves to that primitive stage of ethics, which consists in economic cooperation through free exchange of the material necessities of life. Short of this, war will and must remain as an ultimate resort.

It is because many men in all nations ignorantly, or egotistically and wickedly, refuse to acknowledge this rule of primitive international ethics that there has been given countenance and encouragement to schemes for an "enforcement of peace" which would mean neither more nor less than an "enforcement of injustice." Reason as well as righteousness must, however, prevent us from accepting such programs. Before enforcing peace there obviously must take place a removal of the interest in, motive for, and necessity of war and conquest. Those who without such removal profess to disapprove the "right of conquest" either fool others or are fools themselves. The reign of force would in the long run appear, to most men in all countries, preferable to that of perpetual inequality and iniquity among nations in fundamental issues.

II

A second fundamental aspect of the problem of the League of Nations is that connected with the self determination of nationalities.

It is a connection that moreover is inescapable. For, out of the principle of self determination arise a variety of national interests and an instability of desires and aims, which considerably increase the danger of international differences and conflicts and make it indispensable, if there is to be any measure of security, that there be created some unifying and stabilizing institution such as the League of Nations. On the other hand, such a League would soon become unpopular and be overthrown if it worked in a conservative spirit striving to maintain the *status quo*. For the phenomena of human life are dynamic and kinetic by nature and no force created by man can immobilize them. The self determination of nationalities and the League of Nations thus appear to be corollary and complementary institutions.

Now, whatever differences of opinion may arise concerning the application of the principles involved, on one point there can be no disagreement, namely that if self determination and a League of Nations are to become permanent international institutions, the status of their organization with exact definition of the terms "nation" and "nationality" must be embodied in international law. Any general statement of international law, and any practical attempt at self determination or a formation of a League will be at once confronted with the query: What is a nation?

However astonishing and apparently incredible the assertion, there does not exist, and never will exist, any criterion permitting a sure definition of "nation" or "nationality."

A nation, or a nationality, is not characterized by a common language of its citizens (i. e., Switzerland), or a common religion (Germany), or common origin (United States), common historical traditions (the various nations of the New World) common government (the Jewish and Polish peoples), geographical proximity or common location (the British commonwealth) or by any definite union of these elements. Nationalities and nations are facts—results of contingent facts—without any natural factor or any ruling principle having intervened in their birth, formation and development. Nobody will ever be able to indicate a directing principle justifying discrimination between those sections of human kind that have the "right to self determine" and those which have not; nor to indicate a criterion either to justify admission to a League of Nations or to justify exclusion therefrom.

Since there can be no legal description of the right to self determine and since the statutes of a League are not susceptible of embodiment in international law *with any basic element of truth and permanency*, it follows that the helpful, needful, desirable institutions of self determination and a League of Nations must remain *de facto* and, consequently more or less precarious international institutions.

Therefore, it would be perilous to attribute to or to expect safely to invest in these institutions a fundamental importance in the reconstruction of the world and the establishment of future international order and peace. To achieve this we must conform to and rely on those permanent and eter-

nal truths that affect the destinies of mankind, namely *liberty and righteousness*—to be applied *primarily* in respect to fundamental needs, activities, and relations.

Liberty, righteousness, equality of rights in regard to economic needs, activities and relations;—this is the only natural basis and, therefore, the only true, secure and possible basis for international good will, harmony and peace.

The Passing of the Old Nationalism

"We shall achieve nothing lasting in this 'war to end war' unless, and until, we understand the parent cause of all war, namely, the existence of independent, untrammelled national sovereignties, each acting as an end in itself and recognizing no bounds to its ambition except those imposed by the limits of its own military power.

"The old antithesis between national and international is no longer so sharp because we are growing accustomed to the idea of a kind of European—or even world-wide—statehood, which shall embrace without stifling the old national States. The three great doctrines of the war—the League of Nations, Mitteleuropa, and the Bolshevik idea—are different expressions of this feeling. Each of them presupposes a spiritual condition of Europe to which old frontiers no longer correspond. Each is, of course, so different from the other two that in purpose and effect they come into irreconcilable conflict; but all three have the same birthplace—in the uneasy world-wide sense of discontent with the purely national basis of the old European system.

"We can see the process at work in two profoundly interesting and sharply contrasted ways. At one end of the scale the Allies have laboriously reached certain conclusions which, on being translated into the concrete form of the Versailles Council, turn out to be a local and partial expression of the universal and general principle expounded by President Wilson in his League of Nations.

"In the military sphere and to a certain extent in the economic sphere also Versailles is the first embodiment of the idea of a supra-national authority controlling the actions of hitherto sovereign peoples in alliances. Thus the Allies in Europe, driven by bitter experience, have painfully and haltingly reached the conclusion at which the American President arrived by a process of political deduction.

"The statesmen of the Entente should make plain their intention to develop the Versailles policy until it embraces all the functions which the league itself will discharge when it comes into being. And in particular the Cabinets of London, Paris and Rome must show that they are now conscious of the significance of their own action at Versailles and are prepared to go forward with the enterprise just begun.—*A. F. Whyte, M. P., in "The New Europe."*

The League to Enforce Peace, at its first meeting held since the signing of the armistice, passed a resolution pledging its hearty support of President Wilson in his efforts to organize a League of Nations.

The League to Enforce Peace is planning a nation-wide educational campaign before and at the time of the peace conference in order that the idea of a League of Nations might be everywhere understood.

Pan-American Labor Calls for a League of Free Peoples

The endorsement of the scheme of a League of Nations by the recent Pan-American Labor Conference at Laredo, Texas, is a noteworthy and hopeful sign of the times. The resolution adopted by the Conference is of such importance that we give it here in full:

"Whereas, The delegates of the first Pan-American Federation of Labor Convention, meeting at such a critical time in the world's history, realizing that the problems now confronting humanity in the building of an enduring peace are no less acute than the problems of war, and being deeply and fervently desirous that in the reshaping of the world's affairs the most critical consideration be given those principles that make for an enduring peace and create equality of opportunities for the peoples of all nations; and,

"Whereas, the time has arrived when the organized labor movement, with full understanding of its rights, its power and resources, its value and contribution to society, must bring forward its most profound constructive thought, calculated to establish and insure the principles of true democracy. Therefore, be it resolved

"That we declare that the following essential fundamental principles must underly the peace as well as the principles of all civilized nations: A league of the free peoples of the world in a common covenant for genuine and practical cooperation to secure justice and therefore peace in relations between nations. No political or economic restrictions meant simply to benefit some nations and to cripple or embarrass others; no reprisals based on vindictive purpose, or deliberate desire to injure, but to right manifest wrongs; recognition of rights of small nations and of the principle that no people must be forced under a sovereignty under which it does not wish to live; no territorial changes or adjustments of powers except in furtherance of the welfare of the people affected and in furtherance of world peace. And be it further resolved:

"That in addition to these basic principles there should be incorporated in the treaty which shall constitute the guide of nations of the new period and conditions into which we are entering the following declarations fundamental to the best interests of all nations and of vital importance to wage earners:

"That in law and in practice the principle shall be recognized that the labor of human beings is not a commodity or article of commerce.

"Industrial servitude shall not exist except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.

"The right of free association, free assemblage, free speech and free press shall not be abridged.

"That the seamen of the merchant marine shall be guaranteed the right of leaving their vessels when the same are safe in harbor.

"No article or commodity shall be shipped or delivered in international commerce in the production of which children, under the age of sixteen years, have been employed or permitted to work.

"It shall be declared that the basic work day in industry and commerce shall not exceed eight hours a day.

"Trial by jury shall be established."

"The great renunciation in this solemn affair is not of victory but of vengeance. The greatest acquisition will not be liberated peoples or stolen territories restored or brutal wrongs redressed, although all these must be determined upon, but the League of Nations by means of which humanity is to be freed from the menace of ambition and aggression. Only so can the architects of this victory do else than sow dragons' teeth for future conflicts."—*From an Editorial in the New York "World," November 15, 1918.*

The Church and the League of Nations

"The opportunity of the church of today lies in its using its machinery to present to the people a new conception of international relations consistent with the teaching of the Christian faith."

Arthur Henderson, M. P., October, 1918.

I—ROBERT H. GARDINER

Secretary of the Commission of the Episcopal Church on a World Conference on Faith and Order.

IF the League of Nations is to be of permanent value, it must be a Brotherhood of the World.

The word "League" savors too much of the leagues and alliances of the past, formed, at best, to establish a balance of power, or, at worst, to enable one group of nations to dominate others. President Wilson and Lord Grey, and most of the other advocates of the League of Nations, have in mind a world-wide League which shall be a true Brotherhood of real democracies, but they will have against them, perhaps the more effectively because it will not be openly avowed, all the traditions of diplomacy and most of the strength of the vested interests of commerce and industry and finance. The argument is heard on every side that to keep Germany impotent again to try for that world dominion which the Kaiser and the Junkers sought, she must be kept in subjection, commercially, industrially and financially, as well as in her army and navy. President Wilson has proclaimed that our aim is to set the German people free to join the movement which is transforming the nations into democracies, and the Allies, at least many of the English statesmen, have declared their adherence to his policy. But the interests which are secretly opposing that policy are finding their most profitable course in seeking to prevent us from seeing the distinction between the defeated German militarism and the possible German democracy.

If that democracy is to be established, it cannot be held responsible for the sins of the autocracy which, with our help, it has overthrown. It must be admitted on equal terms into a League of Nations which shall be a true Brotherhood, animated by a common spirit of desire to establish universal justice and righteousness and to give the weak, whether nation or individual, every privilege and opportunity which hitherto has been open only to the strong.

But Brotherhood means Love, and perfect Love is found only in God's revelation of Himself in Jesus. To the Church God has entrusted the duty and privilege of making that revelation

known to all the world. But Love is unity in the Life of God Who is Love, and a divided Church is powerless to proclaim it. If the Churches will humble themselves at the foot of the Cross, they can so lift up Christ before the world that He will draw all men to Himself and His Kingdom of peace and righteousness and love will be established.

The statesmen who will form the Peace Conference can not act avowedly as Christians, for the divisions and worldliness and timidity of the Church have left half the world, and more, in ignorance of the Prince of Peace. But if the Church were one, it could effectively proclaim the Law of Love and so ensure the formation of a League which shall be a true Brotherhood, filled with the vital spirit of regenerating love. If Christians of every name and every country will meet together, in common penitence for the sins of the past, in utter submission to the Will of God, and in fervent prayer that God the Holy Spirit will show them Christ the Way and give them grace to follow Him, they will strengthen the Peace Conference to establish a new world, founded on righteousness and justice, Brotherhood and Love.

Wanted—a Universal Language

The approach of peace is reviving questions as to a universal language in connection with the League of Nations. What is that language to be? Esperanto does not seem to have made much of what should have been a real opportunity, and it looks as if some existing language will have to be used if interpreters are to be dispensed with. The chances seem to favor French, although English has made great strides of late years both in Russia and Italy, while the number of English-speaking Germans, especially in commercial life, has always been large, and England's warm heart for refugees has produced many English-speaking statesmen among the newly enfranchised people. At the same time Continental statesmen might complain that there appear to be two English languages, and that for a foreigner an understanding of the tongue as spoken in London is not an understanding of it as spoken in New York. French is certainly the "second language" of the older men. General Diaz, for instance, speaks fluent French but no English; it is the younger members of his staff who are the English speakers. A knowledge of English is not very common among French notables.—*From the Manchester Guardian.*

Correspondence

The Secret of the American Union

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

In his interesting letter entitled "World Federation Without International Police," in your November issue, Mr. Henry W. Pinkham asks: "If our great federation (the United States) needs no inter-State police force, why should a world federation need an 'international police'?" He then asserts that "the American Union is the model, tested by years of successful working, for the United States of the World," an assertion which he attempts to justify in this way: "The American Union is a non-compulsory partnership of States held together not by force or the fear of force but by an enlightened public opinion based on the manifest and vast mutual benefits that result therefrom."

These last few words suggest that Mr. Pinkham may be open to the consideration of a more realistic explanation of the concord and unity of the United States.

Though not a citizen of this great republic, I venture to observe, first of all, that at one time a state of war existed between the constituent states and that this had its original cause in cross purposes: The South stood for freedom of trade with other nations, but not for freedom for the negro; the North stood for freedom for the negro, but not for freedom of trade. Thus one of the issues was purely economic; from the other economic considerations were far from absent.

Again, to go farther back into the history of the American Union, we find that in the period following the Revolution and preceding the adoption of the Constitution the new federation was almost wrecked by trade wars between the States, notably between New York and its neighbors. Let me quote the following extremely significant passage from John Fiske's "The Critical Periods of American History" (page 146):

"The history of New York, during the five years following the peace of 1783, was a shameful story of greedy monopoly and sectional hate. Of all the thirteen states, none behaved worse, except Rhode Island. A single instance, which occurred early in 1787, may serve as an illustration. The city of New York, with its population of 30,000 souls, had long been supplied firewood from Connecticut, and with butter and cheese, chickens and garden vegetables, from the thrifty farms of New Jersey. This trade, it was observed, carried thousands of dollars out of the city into the pockets of detested Yankees and despised Jerseymen. It was ruinous to domestic industry, said the men of New York. It must be stopped by those effective remedies of the Sangrado school of economic doctors, a navigation act and a protective tariff. Acts were accordingly passed, obliging every Yankee sloop which came down through Hell Gate, and every Jersey market boat which was rowed across from Paulus Hook to Cortlandt Street, to pay entrance fees and obtain clearances at the custom house, just as was done by ships from London or Hamburg; and not a cart-load of Connecticut firewood could be delivered at the back door of a country-house in Beekman Street until it should have paid a heavy duty. Great and just was the wrath of the farmers and lumbermen. The New Jersey legislature made up its mind to retaliate. . . .

Connecticut was equally prompt. At a great meeting of business men, held at New London, it was unanimously agreed to suspend all commercial intercourse with New York. Every merchant signed an agreement, under penalty of \$250 for the first offence, not to send any goods whatever into the hated state for a period of twelve months. By such retaliatory measures, it was hoped that New York might be compelled to rescind her odious enactment. But such meetings and such resolves bore an ominous likeness to the meetings and resolves which in the years before 1775

had heralded a state of war; and but for the good work done by the federal convention another five years would scarcely have elapsed before shots would have been fired and seeds of perennial hatred sown on the shores that look toward Manhattan Island.

I submit that it is beyond dispute that free trade and only free trade within the United States averted the continuous threat of war on this continent. Free trade was, *and still remains*, the realistic "secret" and the essential condition of the harmony and unity of this great republican federation. I may be permitted to ask how long would the constituent states of this union live at peace with each other if they excluded one another from opportunities of trade through protective tariffs or denied to one another the use, on equal terms, of ports, land routes and waterways within their borders? Surely for this great federal commonwealth, internal free trade is the indispensable foundation of internal peace.

I am in substantial agreement with Mr. Pinkham that the American Union provides a model for the "United States of the World" and I therefore suggest that an economic federation of the world's democracies, under a regime of complete freedom of intercourse, would do more for good will among men, for order among nations, for peace on Earth, than any conceivable political federation, however democratically or idealistically inspired in its origin and its constitution.

NERVIUS.

Free Trade the Basis of Permanent Peace

To the Editors of *The World Tomorrow*:

It is a genuine disappointment to find in your editorial, "A League of Nations, Real or Illusory?" in the your October issue, no mention of the prime requisite for any lasting or secure League of Nations. Probably all liberals want to see a League of Nations, disarmament, and permanent peace. Yet none of these is possible without security; and security, based on international morality, can obtain only through the establishment of economic peace by the abolition of tariff barriers.

So long as nations maintain economic forts, called custom houses, at their political frontiers, small nations have an inducement to escape by becoming parts of empires and empires have the strongest incentive to conquer their neighbors, large and small, and to acquire colonies. Thus to obtain and maintain economic "places in the sun" armies and navies and territorial possessions become necessary. For, so long as the power and the willingness to make prohibitive or restrictive tariffs prevails, prosperity and even existence depends upon the forcible control of markets.

But once let international morality in the form of world-wide, absolute freedom of trade be established and guaranteed, and imperialism, with its accompanying armaments, becomes a piece of expensive nonsense. With free access to raw materials and markets in all countries, it becomes a matter of mere sentiment whether Lorraine is under French or German government; Germany has no inducement to conquer other countries; and the United States would without fear or regret let go its expensive and troublesome "colonies."

Those who see this abolition of economic barriers as the pre-requisite and way to permanent peace have established the International Free Trade League, with headquarters at 38 St. Botolph Street, Boston, Massachusetts, and they are working by means of a quarterly—soon to be a monthly—periodical and other methods to spread the light of this gospel. Membership dues, including subscription to *The International Free Trader* are \$1 a year and the cooperation of all is invited.

KENNETH B. ELLIMAN.

Boston, Massachusetts.

British Political Leaders Support the League

The Coalition

Prime Minister Lloyd George has recently signified his full support of a League of Nations in the following emphatic terms: "Such a league is more necessary now than ever. The conditions which prevailed in the Balkans before the war are now affecting practically two-thirds of Europe. A large number of small nations have been reborn in Europe, and these will require a League of Nations to protect them against the covetousness of ambitious and grasping neighbors. In my judgment, a League is absolutely essential to permanent peace. We shall go to the Peace Conference to guarantee that a League of Nations is a reality. I am one of those who believe that without peace we cannot have progress. A League of Nations guarantees peace and guarantees also an all-round reduction of armaments."

The Liberals

Ex-Premier Asquith, who is an enthusiastic supporter of the project of a League of Nations, recently summarised his conception of the league in the following statement to the press:

"No nation ought to be called upon to surrender or impair its effective and complete sovereignty over its own affairs and interests.

"No nation should be allowed to dictate to another forms of legislation or administration or a scheme of government.

"No nation, and no combination of nations, ought to be in a position to prescribe for the rest what its fiscal policy should be. That is a very burning question. Each government must be allowed to tax its people, frame its tariff and carry on its financial system with primary regard to its own interest and the interest of those for whom it is the trustee.

"It would be a very serious handicap to the adoption of a League of Nations if it were to be supposed that by associating one's country with a great international combination one should be called upon in any way to surrender the complete power of self-determination and independent government.

"You cannot have a League of Nations in any but an academic sense, which means an ineffective sense, unless those entering are prepared to recognize that in all countries participating the basis of government should not be autocracy—but complete, unfettered freedom at home.

"Next, they all should be prepared to combine their naval, military and eco-

nomie forces against any member or group of members cherishing and trying to carry into effect aggressive ends.

"War, under modern conditions—and this will be increasingly true as the world develops—is a form of international suicide. That is the motive power for a formation of a League of Nations."

The British Labor Party

Mr. Arthur Henderson, the leader of the British Labor Party, speaking at a recent Conference on the Church and the Problems of the Future, said: "A policy of Pacific Internationalism presupposes two essential conditions—the defeat and destruction of militarist imperialism, and the establishment of a League of Nations equipped to make the world safe for democracy. The League of Nations seems to be the only practical suggestion for promoting and maintaining the unity of the people, though the final safeguard of peace does not lie in the machinery of judicial arbitration and conciliation, but in the spirit of friendship, the spirit of cooperation, the product of an international compact based upon the fundamental identity of the people's interests. To be successful the League of Nations must be the fruit of the affections, for the people of the world are one family."

The Irish Party

T. P. O'Connor, M. P., the well known Irish leader, in a recent public speech said that peace ought to end in a League of Nations, the same justice, fair dealing, equality and cooperation between nations as between individuals. He saw nothing visionary in the idea. On the contrary, if peace did not end in a League of Nations, the precious blood spilled would have been shed in vain."

The Conservatives

Lord Robert Cecil, M.P., speaking in London on November 6th as Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said: "We talk lightly of a League of Nations, some of us, and I am not sure that all those who talk about it have really considered what it means. We have to recognize two principles, both entitled to our warmest support—national sovereignty and international cooperation. Believe me, only those who have tried in detail to reconcile those principles know the difficulties that there are. But that we ought to try, that we ought to set up some system of that kind, that we ought to establish it as a guarantee for our descendants against the evils we have been

through, no one who is neither a lunatic nor an imbecile can doubt.

"We have to do something, and let us approach the task in the right spirit. Let us cast aside as far as we can selfish aims, selfish ambitions, and selfish aspirations, and approach this task in that spirit and with those desires, and I doubt not we may bring it to a successful conclusion."

A Representative Colonial Opinion

General Smuts, member of the British War Cabinet, in a recent speech said: "We must feel that in the call to common humanity there are other purposes besides the prevention of war, for which a League of Nations is a sheer, practical necessity. One of the first steps must be to create an organization against hunger and ration all the countries where disaster threatens. The existing inter-allied machinery, which is the nucleus of a League of Nations, probably will undertake this task. In the period of reconstruction after the war, all countries, Allied, neutral and enemy, will have to be rationed for certain raw materials. Here again international machinery is necessary. We thus are making straight for a League of Nations charged with the performance of these international functions. As regards the primary object of the League. From Finland to Constantinople the map will be covered with small nations divided by profound antipathies and most of them with minorities conducive to internal weakness. We may, therefore, expect more dangers of wars in Europe than in the past. Therefore it is imperative that we create an international organization to keep peace."

The World Tomorrow

is published monthly by The Fellowship Press, Incorporated (at 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.), established by The Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is issued not as an official organ, but as a medium for the free discussion of questions relative to the interpretation of Christianity to our age and its application for the reconstruction of society.

The Fellowship Press, Inc.: Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of *The World Tomorrow*: Norman Thomas, Managing Editor; Edward W. Evans, Harold A. Hatch, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward, and Walter G. Fuller, Secretary.

LIGIOUS UNITY

subject will be presented in the number of "The Arbitrator" in the way. Authoritative statements of beliefs of various sects will be acquired by a questionnaire designed to assist in reaching the truth regarding doctrinal fundamentals that are usually evaded.

Each month a different topic of social, moral, or religious significance is discussed by experts.

Price Ten Cents a Copy
Twenty-five Cents for Three Months
One Dollar a Year

"Religion and the New American Democracy," by Joseph E. McAfee; or, "The New Social Order in America," by Hornell Hart, will be presented to new subscribers on request.

THE ARBITRATOR
P. O. BOX 42, WALL ST. STATION
NEW YORK CITY

A REPUBLIC OF NATIONS

A Study of the Organization of a Federal League of Nations

By RALEIGH C. MINOR

Professor of Constitutional and International Law at the University of Virginia

316 Pages. Net \$2.50

Deals with the formation of a permanent alliance which, while guaranteeing to each state a peaceful and proper independence in its internal affairs, will also adequately protect each against oppressive and unjust actions of that independence by neighbors, and is better prepared to utilize their strength.

The appendix contains the Constitution of the United States, and a tentative Constitution of the proposed Nations in parallel columns.

At All Bookstores

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMERICAN BRANCH
Five West Thirty-Second Street, New York

THE LIBERATOR

"The most stimulating magazine in America"

Editors: Max Eastman
Crystal Eastman

Associate Editor: Floyd Dell

Contributing Editors. Cornelia Barns, Howard Brubaker, Hugo Gellert, Arturo Giovannitti, Charles T. Halliday, Helen Keller, Robert Minor, Boardman Robinson, Alexander Trachtenberg, Louis Untermeyer, Art Young.

The world is in the rapids. The possibilities of change in this day are beyond all imagination. We must unite our hands and voices to make the end of this war the beginning of an age of freedom and happiness for mankind undreamed by those whose minds comprehend only political and military events. With this ideal THE LIBERATOR came into existence.

Published monthly by The Liberator Publishing Co., 34 Union Square, New York.

"Being a public school teacher the rut I am in has a depth all its own. The Liberator always lifts me out of it to a belief that life is rich and worth while and adventuresome."

Pin \$1.00 to this slip and mail today for an 8 months' trial subscription.

Send me The Liberator for 8 months, beginning with the.....number.

Name.....

Address.....

THE NEED OF KNOWING

I have been fascinated, in reading Joseph Kinmont Hart's new book on "Democracy in Education" (\$1.80: a history of education written from a new angle), to discover in his story of the days of Socrates an exceedingly helpful approach to the great problem of today.

"Reconstruction" means to Mr. Hart "readjustment to changed internal and external conditions of group life"—not the mere settling back to an ante-bellum topia. "This involves the conscious and intelligent construction of new habits to meet new conditions, invention of new social customs and attitudes, attention to elements of experience and conditions hitherto unnoticed,——"

Need I quote more to show why in this crisis you should read, read, read; and why

you ought to keep in touch with the, and let bookstore that specializes in Reconstruction spirit. Books? can selfishish aspira-

If you haven't yet done so now is a spirit time to study Brailsford's League of Nations (\$2.00) and Bertrand Russell's Political Ideals (\$1.00). And among the newer books you will want Maud Royden's Women and the Sovereign State (\$1.00). I heard a state chairman of the Women's National Party tell a friend not to live another week without reading it.

And don't forget to send for our Reconstruction Booklet. C. H. H.

THE BOOK HOUSE
17 North State Street
CHICAGO

Do You Rely Wholly Upon
The Controlled Press

For Your Knowledge Of

The New World Order?

The world-wide demand of the workers for greater opportunities of life, joy and self-government is carefully reported and sympathetically interpreted month by month in

FORWARD

Cut this out and mail with one dollar

Please send me Forward for one year.

Name.....

Address.....

FORWARD, Room 428, 126 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

THE OAKWOOD SEMINARY FOR BOYS AND
GIRLS

Secondary school. Endowed and managed by Friends. Prepares for any college. Quaker friends have world-wide recognition. Board and tuition \$350. Send for catalogue.

William J. Reagan, A. M., Principal
Union Springs-on-Cayuga Lake, N. Y.

The Society of Friends

(Quakers)

Books at:—

144 East 20th Street, New York;
Friends' Book Store, Richmond,
Ind.

Schools at:—

Union Springs, N. Y.; George
School, Pa.; Vassalboro, Me.;
Spiceland, Ind.; Plainfield, Ind.

Colleges at:—

Haverford, Pa.; Guilford College, N. C.; Wilmington, Ohio;
Earlham, Ind.; Oskaloosa, Iowa;
Wichita, Kans.; Central City,
Neb.; Newberg, Ore.; Whittier,
Calif.

Information at Mt. Kisco, N. Y.

M. L. S.